The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:

REV. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D.
REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
DR. WILL G. MOORE, M.A.
REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.
REV. LESLIE J. TIZARD, B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 35 Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XXII. No. 2. **APRIL, 1944**

CONTENTS

(Continued from cover)

PAGE

ON LIFE AND BOOKS—
ECCLESIA ANGLICANA - - - - - - ALBERT PEEL 157

FOREIGN IMPRESSION—
WILFRED MONOD - - - - - - JESSIE FORSYTH ANDREWS 162

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS - - - - - - - 164

CURRENT LITERATURE. By Drs. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, P. N. HARRISON, A. J. GRIEVE, W. B. SELBIE, R. S. FRANKS, and the EDITOR - 165

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR, Dr. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, and the Revs. A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., and G. F. NUTTALL, M.A, B.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - 176

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS - - - - - - - - - - - 190

CORRESPONDENCE—
THE MAKING OF THE INDIAN PRINCES - By Dr. E. THOMPSON 191

A LUCKY BAG - - - - - - - - By Mrs. J. LLOYD 192

THE CHURCHES AND HEALTH - - CIVIL DEFENCE OFFICER 192

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

BOOKS *for*
SELF INSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT

By W. J. ENNEVER
YOUR MIND AND HOW TO USE IT
A complete course of self instruction by the founder of Pelmanism. Deals with all essential mental needs, concentration, memory, self-confidence, fears, inferiority, feelings, will-power, imagination, personality. It offers a plan by world-famous experts for developing a trained mind at a fraction of the usual cost. **5/6**

By W. WELBY
MIND YOUR MIND—
Simple Psychology for the Layman
Written to provide an explanation of the elements of Psychology. The importance of this science is obvious, and there can be no doubt that an understanding of its principles has become an essential factor in adult education. **5/6**

By J. LOUIS ORTON
MEMORY EFFICIENCY
and How to Obtain It
This book tells how you can acquire a photographic memory. In mastering its contents you will find that doubt, indecision and fear disappear. Inferior complex is conquered by a confidence based upon the firm foundation of a well-trained mind. **5/6**

THE CURE OF STAMMERING, STUTTERING, and other Speech Disorders
There is no need for anyone to endure the misery of Faulty Speech or Harsh Utterance! This book *is the remedy*. The simple non-operative means which have cured thousands are clearly set out. **3/4**

By W. EDWIN BYWATER
POWER OF THOUGHT
An examination in popular form of the creation and nature of thought and its effects on behaviour, character, the individual, and on others. **5/6**

By MEDICUS, M.A., B.Sc., M.B., C.M.
KNOW THY BODY—
The Wonders Within Us
The most entertaining physological work ever written. This book explains the working of every human organ. You will understand yourself the better for reading this popular work. **5/6**

By H. BENJAMIN
BETTER SIGHT WITHOUT GLASSES
The author cured himself of rapidly-approaching blindness, and has embodied his successful methods in this book for the benefit of all sufferers. **5/6**

By J. C. THOMSON
HIGH AND LOW BLOOD PRESSURE
The how and why of high and low blood pressure, and the simple naturopathic home treatment for this prevalent condition is fully explained. **5/6**

THE HEART
The prevention and relief of cardiac conditions by the new 'Kingston' methods are lucidly explained in this book. **4/4**

Prices include Postage. Get your copies of these important books NOW—From

THORSONS Publishers Ltd
Dept. 139, 91 ST. MARTIN'S LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.
Full Catalogue available on request.
ENCLOSE 2 STAMPS.

BM/BOOK

THE DEMAND FOR NEW AUTHORS

has increased as a result of the war. We are specialist tutors in fiction-writing, and our students include members of all classes of the community, from University Professors and Government Officials to titled Ladies and high-ranking Officers.

In every promising case we guarantee success or a refund of fees. The following sample letters, written by students at an early stage in the Course, reveal how well founded is our confidence in our guarantee: —

From the Reverend F. N. Hale: "Thank you for the lectures. I must say it has been amazing to find that plotting and presentation can be presented with such precision, and at the same time with such obvious sense."

From Mrs. Dodds, after completing only seven of the twenty lectures: "You will be interested to know that 'Makeshift Marriage' has been accepted by *Wife and Home* for £8 8s. Better still, the editress asks to see further work." (Making a total of 13 stories sold by this student after seven lectures.)

From Major W. N. Griffiths, after four lectures: "I am pleased to say that results are still good. My total now is on the 50 mark, with several new markets."

If you aspire to become a writer of saleable fiction, send a sample of your work, or a letter about yourself, to Mr. Martin Walter, the author of the Scientific System of Fiction-writing. He will then inform you whether our guarantee can be extended to your case. A copy of Mr. Walter's handbook, "The Professional Touch," is also available post free on request.

Mr. MARTIN WALTER.
Controller,
British Institute of Fiction-writing Science, Ltd.
Regent House, Regent Street, W.1.

The Sign of Science and SALES

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rt. Rev. Bishop H. Hensley Henson, D.D. Formerly Bishop of Durham.

Rev. Geraint V. Jones, M.A., B.Litt. Congregational Minister, Halifax.

Rev. A. E. Snashall. Congregational Minister, Yapton.

Mr. John Archer. Printer and Publisher, Northampton.

Mr. H. R. Chillingworth, M.A. Formerly Senior Languages Master, Dublin High School.

Mrs. Frieda J. Demarest, M.A. Representative in Britain of the American Congregationalists' War Victims Committee.

A Youth Leader. From a Congregational Church in the Midlands.

Dr. E. L. Allen, M.A. Lecturer in Theology and Religious Knowledge, King's College, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Mrs. Jessie Forsyth Andrews, B.A. King's Langley.

Rev. P. N. Harrison, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. Author of *The Pastoral Epistles, etc.*

The Congregational Devotional Book, 1944

THE DRAMA OF THE CROSS

C. STANLEY HERBERT, B.D., with a Foreword by Dr. SIDNEY BERRY.

"To focus the thoughts of all of us on some of the great themes of the Christian faith."

Cloth, Gilt. 5s. net
(Post 4d.)

Of all Booksellers

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

Now on Sale

THE CHRISTIAN BASIS OF DEMOCRACY

Essays delivered in the University of North Wales

ALBERT PEEL, M.A., Litt.D.

"A powerful and persuasive plea for true democracy, based on Christian liberty."—*Inquirer.*

Cloth. 4s. 6d.
(Post 3d.)

Of all Booksellers

Independent Press Ltd.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

THE FORWARD BOOKS

Edited by **John Marsh, M.A.**

Designed paper wrappers, **2s.** each.

1. **THE LIVING GOD.** By **John Marsh.**
2. **CONGREGATIONALISM AND THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.** By **Nathaniel Micklem.**
3. **THE OPEN BIBLE.** By **R. K. Orchard.**
4. **THE MINISTRY.** By **John Huxtable.**
5. **THE MAN IN THE STREET.** By **W. A. Whitehouse.**
6. **THE NONCONFORMIST CONSCIENCE.** By **H. F. Lovell Cocks.**
7. **THE HOLY SPIRIT.** By **H. Cunliffe-Jones.**

If ordered by post, please add 1d. in each 1s. for postage.

Independent Press Ltd.
Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

WRITING on the first day of March in the days of the lull before the storm, we have more than ever the feeling that any comments will be out of date by the time they are read. The quarter has seen great progress in the Pacific, the Russian advance steadily pressed, and the intensification of the bombing of Germany by night and by day. In Italy the invading armies are still held, and criticism of the failure of the Anzio attempt to force the pace is beside the mark, however natural. It may be true, and probably is, that a more adventurous policy once the landing had been successfully made would have paid, but it is not for critics, safe in their arm-chairs at home, to risk other men's lives. Where there is room for criticism is in the sphere of publicity and propaganda. Nobody seems to estimate the effect of the spoken word on the minds of people at home and abroad; it is folly, *e.g.*, to allow references to the immense importance of the air-fields at Foggia without suggesting it may be months before they can be fully used, or to talk of "In Rome by Christmas" without measuring the reaction failure to reach this objective might cause. If British achievements in the three Services and magnificent heroism could be paralleled in the field of propaganda, progress could be accelerated and friction avoided. The question in every mind is whether the bombing of Germany can bring the War in Europe to a conclusion without an invasion which would entail heavy losses. Speculation where the invasion will be is futile, but it is probably not without significance that two islands now in Allied hands have scarcely been mentioned for a couple of months. We suspect they will be in the news ere long.

At home, the Prime Minister, in whose recovery of health and safe return home all rejoice, maintains his supremacy and still possesses the full confidence of the people. Signs that the Government is beginning to realize that the country is determined on social progress after the war are not lacking: a series of by-elections has produced a crop of results which has opened the eyes even of the Conservative majority in the House of Commons. Some way of invigorating that jaded House is necessary, and if there cannot be a General Election, the electorate, knowing that the Prime Minister is secure, will vote freely at by-elections. It would perhaps be useful if members of the Government could attend meetings of the

Common Wealth Party *incognito*. We are told that the most striking feature about them is that the audience consists of young people, which in these days means people in uniform. If the gulf between the ideals of such young people and legislation becomes too wide, the pendulum's swing to the Left after the war will be violent indeed.

Meanwhile people in this country are learning something about the constitution of the United States, and studying the ancient conflict between legislative and executive functions. There are many queries about the President's position; nobody, even in America, dare prophesy with confidence what will happen in November, or even at the Republican Convention. Much will depend on the war situation, but it may be noted that "Needy *versus* greedy" is not a bad election slogan!

* * *

We like this story, from a letter of Miss Evelyn Underhill, dated 27th November, 1940. And we do not think it patriotic prejudice that makes us believe that it could not be told of Hitler or Mussolini:

> Gywnedd turned up on Sunday after a long absence. . . . She told us that early one morning after a recent raid the head of their local Toc H heard a knock on the remains of the front-door, went down and found a stocky figure in mac. and tin-hat, who said, "I just looked in to see whether you were all right here". The head replied that they were; and the visitor said, "I'm glad to hear that. Carry on; and God bless you".
>
> It was Winston Churchill. It appears he often goes out alone in the early morning and looks round districts where the blitz has been bad.

* * *

Last quarter we mentioned a well-informed reader's concern at Allied pre-occupation with the future of Germany, and its neglect of what he conceived to be an even more difficult problem—the future of Japan. That concern will certainly not be dissipated, or even diminished, by a reading of Mr. Hugh Byas's *Government by Assassination* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Mr. Byas lived in Japan for twenty-three years, and was the correspondent of the *New York Times*, which at present we consider the world's best newspaper—certainly the best known to us. He has stories to tell, almost "too crazy to be credible", of assassination, blackmail, and the attempt to synthesize incompatible ideas. He describes the Army as "collective *führer*", and shows how the independence of the fighting services from political control prevented any chance of the evolution of Japan into a liberal modern State: in 1941 the Navy Minister said, "The Prime Minister cannot participate in the prerogatives of the supreme command in any way". This control

of the government by the fighting services was one of the main causes for the War, the others being:

1. The delusion of a unique State with a special mission.
2. The possession of jumping-off places for aggression and of the heaviest and best-organized armaments in Asia.

This will serve to indicate the position from which Mr. Byas surveys the life of Japan—the section on the Emperor is very good—and the complexity of the problem to be faced when victory is won. One or two extraordinary epithets (what is "medieval-minded"?), "new" for "few" on p. 248, and absent "quotes" on p. 289 are small blemishes on a book which should be read and pondered by all who want to bring informed minds to bear on the post-war situation.

As we read this proof news comes that Japan has taken the unprecedented step of appointing the Prime Minister, General Tojo, Chief of the Army General Staff. The significance of the move remains to be seen; its importance will not be lost on readers of Mr. Byas's book.

* * *

It is a pity that Mr. Michael Straight's *Make This the Last War* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) does not appear in England until two years after it was written; events have moved so quickly that some of it seems already ancient, and this is emphasized by the breathlessness of Mr. Straight's style. For a Cambridge man—he was the first American to be elected President of the Union—Mr. Straight makes some extravagant assertions; on the same page we are told (1) "when the Irish were forced to speak the language that the world spoke, Irish poets and playwrights dominated the entire world with their literature", and (2) "on an island, secession is physically impossible, islands are peaceful places"—and this in the next paragraph to one referring to Ireland! Nevertheless this exuberance, and the fact that he uses "transient" for "transport", should not deter the reader, for this is a book important in itself, and more important in that it suggests that in Mr. Straight there is a combination of idealism and practicality found only too rarely.

The section on the organization of the United Nations, showing what common planning in many fields has been able to accomplish, is particularly useful, for its contents are far from being generally known. Mr. Straight insists—the word "must", by the way, appears too often in his pages—that such planning by the United Nations and the present controls must be maintained after the War. He paints a picture of the problems of the post-War world both realistic and terrifying, and makes his point that no one nation and no return to the pre-War political and economic system can avert disaster. He argues that

> a nation which is forced to undertake industrialization out of its own resources can only do this by exploiting the great mass of its people—the farm population—to such an extent that democratic institutions must be suppressed.

It is already apparent that in Mr. Straight's country and our own we have a long way to go before majorities are convinced that only by the United Nations planning together for themselves and for the world can collapse be avoided. There lies before us a letter just received from a well-known American in which he says Americans are not thinking through the economic problems of the peace. "We are going to insist on selling goods and not buying them. We are going to compete like mad. . . . ". Many here have the same ideas. Devastated Europe must be rebuilt and re-equipped, our ally China must be supplied with a thousand and one things, and we must see we get our full share of the trade, and therefore we too shall "compete like mad". A burst of prosperity, a sudden saturation point—yes, even with China, remembering all the plants ready to switch from war to peace production—and then depression, mass unemployment. The alternative is suggested in Mr. Straight's stirring book, and that makes it worth reading, though its bias against "imperialism", and especially about India, is certain to prevent it from receiving due recognition in many quarters.

* * *

At the time of writing the Education Bill is making its slow progress through the House of Commons. From all sides there have been expressions of approval, even if there has often been a "But", and the chances are that the Bill will go through substantially unaltered. For the advances it proposes we have nothing but praise, though we wish there had been more definite commitments about raising the school age, nursery and continuation schools, and so forth. With the war still on and the future uncertain, perhaps Mr. Butler has done the best that could be done; it will be for all who believe in education to strengthen his hands, and secure that the Bill's proposals be implemented and improved upon at the earliest possible moment.

The Churches have not, we fear, come well out of the discussions; they have given the impression that they were more concerned with their own interests than with those of the children of the land. The Roman Catholics have been out to get as much financial help from the State as possible, and it is plain that Anglicans have felt their own schools would be safeguarded by Roman activity. To the denominationalists it never seems to occur that if parents believe that the education given by the State is incomplete and unsatisfactory, they themselves should be prepared to pay for their extra requirements. It is not the business of the State to

make children into good Catholics, Anglicans, or Baptists: that is the business of the parents themselves and of the Churches to which they belong. That clergy, ministers, and parents are ill-equipped, and all branches of Christians unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to enable the Churches to give distinctive teaching is no justification for demanding that the State should provide it. If the Churches were to devote the money now spent on obsolete and superfluous buildings, over-large salaries, and elaborate machinery, and if they were to make use of "voluntary clergy", they would have ample resources for the teaching of the form of Christianity they favoured.

It looks as if verbal acknowledgment of the injustices suffered by Free Churchmen in single-school areas and a few kind words from the Archbishop of Canterbury will be all that happens, and that the policy of a public school within the reach of every child will be brought only a little nearer by the Bill.

We are not among those who believe that the Anglican leaders have played an astute game and outmanœuvred the Free Churches, though on the surface there is much to be said for the contentions of those who take this view. Fifteen years ago many Anglicans would admit in private, "Our schools are done for"; ten years ago they would suggest that if agreed syllabuses were accepted in all schools they were prepared to see the end of the dual system. Then suddenly they are given a "glorious opportunity" to save many of their schools: they take advantage of Catholic activity on the one side and of the Free Church desire for peace on the other, and hope that the teachers in war-time will be so sick to death of religious strife that they will fall in with proposals incorporated in a Bill which makes for general educational progress. That is accurate history, we believe, though we need not assume that Anglicans have been guilty of supreme Jesuitry. But the recrudescence of talk about Nonconformists getting all they want in "simple Bible teaching" or "agreed syllabuses", and being unwilling to recognize the huge sacrifices made by the supporters of non-provided schools (the total figures of initial outlay and of amounts received from local educational authorities would be revealing) serves to arouse suspicion.

It is worth following up the dissatisfaction of some Anglicans with "simple Bible teaching" and "agreed syllabuses". What is wanted in addition ? "Church teaching", they say, generally with the reminder that it has long been declared legal to teach the Apostles' Creed in provided schools. And when pressed as to what is "Church teaching", it is found to include not merely the Creed, but the teaching that the Church is a continuation of the Incarnation, that a threefold ministry based on Apostolical Succession is a *sine qua non,* and that Sacraments are obligatory and are invalid

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

except when administered by the episcopally ordained. We shall watch the evolution of the "agreed syllabus" with interest. The kind of development many Anglicans desire is stated without any camouflage in the Rev. R. Lumb's "Evangelistic Programme for Education", *Beyond the White Paper* (Dacre Press, 3s. 6d.), which argues that "agreed" syllabuses do not give "Church teaching" about the Bible and have no authority from the Church, and that "our long-term policy should aim at denominational teaching in all State schools". Meanwhile we believe that the reaction of the non-religious to the insistent claims of the denominationalists will be increased indifference to organized Christianity; it is a pity the leaders of the Churches are so aloof from ordinary folk that the cynical comments heard on every side never reach them.

Imagine how different would have been the impression if the Bishops had announced that, as the Church of England was financially interested in the proposals, they would take no part in the Lords' discussion of the relevant clauses of the Bill; and further, that they were willing to make any sacrifices in single-school areas so that the injustice to Nonconformists might be removed.

Let it not be thought that in saying this we are contending that the Free Churches are superior to the Church of England. In this instance Free Churchmen are claiming nothing for themselves, but we do not see in any branch of organized Christianity any willingness to renounce an iota of power, prestige, or the advantages money secures. Bishops, Moderators, ministers, deacons, cling to pomp, dignity, authority, office, in a way they would scorn to do in their private capacities. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr has written about moral man in an immoral society, and it often seems to us that the ethical standards of Churches as now organized are below those of the individuals composing them. Men and women who in their personal lives are making heroic sacrifices and apparently never thinking of self, when banded together become avid of power, acquisitive and intolerant, and will give up nothing. "We must keep what we have", "*Our* church must be rebuilt"—it almost seems as if the injunctions about self-denial, taking up one's cross, walking the second mile, are held to have no application except to the individual.

* * *

THIS is almost a Church of England number, what with an article on "Disestablishment", "*Ecclesia Anglicana*" in "Life and Books", and sundry other matters. That Church is, as other branches of the Christian Church, at the parting of the ways, and we wish we could see more signs of her willingness to abandon ecclesiastical "power politics" and rely on spiritual forces alone, and thus give a real lead to Christendom. From time to time indignant Nonconformists write to the papers to ask what has be-

come of the Nonconformist social conscience, to demand where are the Cliffords and Hornes of today, and why leadership has been allowed to fall into the hands of the Archbishops! We rejoice in all such leadership, gleefully pointing out to Anglican friends that their leaders now declaim "politics in the pulpit" in tones which make the speeches of Clifford and Horne sound like "the wooing note" of which J. H. Jowett used to speak.

It must be confessed, however, that the leadership is perhaps more in appearance than reality, being due to the Church of England Press Bureau, which has begun to function with remarkable efficiency since Dr. Temple became Primate. A synopsis of all the Archbishop's utterances on major topics is sent out before delivery, and this goes far to explain his "good press". This is a development on which the Church of England is to be congratulated, but it throws into relief the ineffectiveness of Free Church propaganda. The Moderator of the Federal Free Church Council or the Presidents of the denominations often make speeches, but their words rarely travel beyond hearing distance. And if it be said these are but minor stars, while the Archbishop is a fixed star, or a constellation in himself, this does not apply to the Secretaries of the denominations. A Free Church Press Bureau is overdue: Dr. Scott Lidgett's useful statement on education ought to have been widely circulated as a matter of routine six months before it began to reach the wider world. At present publicity is spasmodic and nobody's business. No wonder, then, that it is assumed that the Archbishops lead and Free Churchmen are dumb.

* * *

This year sees the Centenary of the Society for the Liberation of the Church of England from State Patronage and Control, and we are sure that our readers will welcome Bishop Hensley Henson's article on "Disestablishment". But how rarely is Disestablishment mentioned on Free Church platforms today! Those who entered the ministry since "the war to end war" have probably never heard a speech on the subject, even though there was a flicker of interest when Parliament rejected the Revised Prayer Book. It is strange to look back fifty years and see how widespread then was the assumption that the life of an Established Church in England was likely to be very short. In the second volume of his autobiography Bishop Hensley Henson asks why Nonconformists have ceased to interest themselves in a campaign that once meant so much to them. The answer he himself supplies in part in the article within —the victories won by the Liberation Society have removed the major grievances of Free Churchmen, and taken the edge from their assault. Equally important is the fact that Free Churchmen, while still believing in "a free Church within a free State", are anxious to do nothing to stir up strife between Christians, and so

content themselves with hoping that the demand for Disestablishment will come from within the Church. The trouble arises from the fact that the party within the Church which has been most vocal for Disestablishment is the party which has been least ready to obey the Church's laws and rubrics. For ourselves, we should not let that stand in the way. We think the Church of England would gain so much by freedom that we should be prepared to take any risk. We prefer an Anglo-Catholic (though we do not understand him) to an Erastian any day, and for that reason we held that Parliament should have allowed the Church the Prayer Book it desired, even while recognizing that this meant the Church of England was both having its cake and eating it. If, as Anglicans have been known to maintain, the only thing that suffices to keep them together—Low and High and Broad and Modern—is the State connexion, disunity would surely be preferable to a comprehensiveness for which such a price has to be paid.

We ourselves should be quite willing to respond to the appeal to Free Churchmen Bishop Hensley Henson makes at the end of his article. But we must confess that we see no sign here, or in other fields, that the Church of England is willing to relinquish any fraction of its prestige or privilege.

Readers who desire to know what the Liberation Society is doing today should write to Mr. W. J. Rowland, 32 Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1.

* * *

A LETTER *The Times* did not print:

> Sir,
>
> One of the most encouraging signs of our times is the Catholic concern for minorities. It is interesting to observe this in Catholic countries, to notice, *e.g.*, in Spain how there are Protestant schools governed by Protestant managers with Protestant teaching by Protestant teachers maintained largely at the expense of the community.

* * *

Is there the sound of a going in the tops of the trees, or is it merely wishful thinking? From many parts of the country come reports of groups of Civil Defence Workers, Fire Fighters, *etc.*, eagerly welcoming clergy and ministers who will discuss with them in an informal way matters concerning the Kingdom of God. And when on the B.B.C. a speaker speaks with passion and sincerity, so that his obvious integrity overcomes the medium—as in Principal Elmslie's recent series or that of Prof. John Foster—the response is immediate.

There were encouraging signs too in the last number of the *Presbyterian Register* which came to our hands. Not only is the Church of Scotland engaged in country-wide evangelistic efforts

varying in form, not only is the work in factories meeting with some success, but even from prostrate France comes welcome evidence that Protestantism is planning for the future. A suggested plan of reconstruction includes these four points:

> I. Transform our parishes, which too often are mere audiences, into real Christian communities. Too often, the members sit side by side without knowing one another and without really being able to love one another. . . . To remedy this situation, opportunities for personal contacts must be multiplied in the churches. . . . Neighbours and friends will be invited to these meetings, which may thus become an effective method of evangelism.
>
> II. Organise the ministry of the laity in the Church. To give strength and vigour to our churches, the lay ministry must be organised. . . . In particular, our churches must provide for the training of lay preachers and make full use of their services. Thanks to their help, they will be able to keep open all the existing posts, establish new ones despite the present financial difficulties and face the evangelistic task which is incumbent upon them.
>
> III. Take the necessary measures to enable grown men exercising a trade or a liberal profession, who have received a call of God, to complete their training both rapidly and thoroughly and enter in the usual way into the ranks of the ministry. Such men will bring into the ministry, hitherto recruited in a too exclusively academic way, the direct experience of the real life of our fellow-citizens, the knowledge of different social groups, and also the special capacities developed by a sound professional training. . . .
>
> IV. Reform of the theological faculties. As there are differences in gifts and vocations, there ought to be varied types of training to produce different types of pastors. All the ministries would remain equal, equivalent, without barriers between them.

All these are significant. At the National Synod, speaking on "The Restoration of the Ministries", Pastor Lestringant urged that there was one ministry in the Church, but it branched out into special ministries:

> Special spiritual gifts create the special functions: gifts which God gives to a person for the common service. The exercise of these gifts is more or less compatible with professional work which provides the means of subsistence; but in so far as those who exercise them have to devote a greater amount of time to them, it becomes necessary for the Church to support them.
>
> The Reformed Book of Discipline of 1559 recognises three ministries: pastor, elder, deacon. The pastor is ordained; the elders and deacons are elected for life. The office of the elder

> is to see to the good progress of the Church and not only to give counsel. The deacons are charged with the works of charity. Pastors, elders and deacons are united in action; they can do nothing without one another.
>
> All this, he said, shows the unfaithfulness of the present parishes when they share in the abstention of the members of the Church from its ministry and impose all its ministries on a single man. The eldership and the diaconate must again become real ministries.
>
> First of all, however, the ministry of the Word must be safeguarded. The dissemination of the Protestants calls for a larger number of pastors; and at the same time it demands that the pastors shall be aided by non-professional ministers who remain permanently in places to which the overworked pastor can only come in passing.

We have long urged that this is the true line of development of the ministry, and it is interesting indeed to notice these proposals in the Reformed Church of France.

* * *

In the same copy of the *Presbyterian Register* is an appeal for pastoral visitation. Ministers in Scotland, it is said, visit their congregations, but not their parishes, with the result that

> in a city with 150 parishes and 150 ministers, each of these ministers goes careering daily over the whole of these parishes to visit his own members. Surely a waste of energy to make the angels weep! While the non-churchgoing and unattached in every parish are left rarely—or more usually, never—visited at all. How much juster and better for each minister (perhaps with his assistants and elders) to visit regularly and frequently every house in his own parish door by door. . . . Thus every soul in the land would be approached and invited, with—*olim experto credo*—most heartening results.

150 ministers careering about a city daily may be true in Scotland, but it is scarcely true of England, where, it has to be confessed, not even members of congregations are visited, for many ministers declare that they "do not believe in visitation". Probably among the many causes of the fall in church attendance the lack of personal interest shown by pastoral visitation is one of the most operative. The old adage, "A house-going minister makes a church-going people", is still true, and young ministers who have never engaged in pastoral visitation do not know the opportunities of service they miss or the stimulus they fail to receive. It is almost possible to deduce from some sermons that ministers have no pastoral contact with their people: no wonder that in such cases the number of the people steadily diminishes.

* * *

It is almost pathetic to note the morbid desire of many Anglicans to secure union with the Orthodox Church, more especially when this is combined with something akin to contempt for the Protestant Churches of the United States, which often show a virility which should shame other Communions.

With this in mind it has been of interest to read Mr. Paul B. Anderson's chapter in *People, Church and State in Modern Russia* on the relations between these two Churches. The Metropolitan Sergius in 1931 wrote words of wisdom about union which Anglicans should have found chastening:

> We on our side cannot give up our belief that only our Orthodox Church, found in its completeness in the East, is the Church of Christ. The uniting with our Church of some other body we can conceive of only by the analogy of the saving of the drowning. It would be strange if the drowning, before accepting help from the ship, should begin to put forward some sort of conditions. This would be a clear evidence of the fact that he either does not wish to be saved, or does not realize the hopelessness of his position.
>
> If for union with the Anglicans just at this time concessions are demanded of us, even hurried ones (without adequate preparation for them in the Orthodox mind as a whole), then there is reason to fear that the fruit of all negotiations and discussions will be not authentic unity of the Anglicans with the Church, but only external, so to speak, a diplomatic union, hiding inner differences. But for the Church of Christ in its real sense, from the standpoint of her eternal purpose—the salvation of souls (which alone justifies the existence of the Church) —such a union cannot have any particular value, it is rather even dangerous. Like every union which is based on reservations, such a union in its very self carries the germs of dissolution. . . . Old Catholicism and Anglicanism separated from Rome when Rome itself was in schism [since 1054]. Their separation was in effect a withdrawal from schism, even though it has not been crowned as yet by reunion with the Church. They must be blamed not for separation, but rather for failing in all this time to go the rest of the way. However, by their separation they, of course, weakened the Roman schism and thereby in part strengthened the position of the Orthodox Church. It is natural also for them to look upon our Church as an ally, and to have interest and sympathy for her; and for our Church to have hope that condescension toward them will serve for the salvation of a greater number of persons.

The Metropolitan goes on to discuss the nature of the true Church, emphasizing Apostolic Succession and affirming that "The Church of Christ always understood its unity to lie in the one Eucharist" in a way that shows the gulf which separates the Church

to which he belongs from that of Churches of the Reformed and Anabaptist traditions. The Free Churches must stand with the Metropolitan in deprecating a unity which conceals vital differences, but they should also insist that in any proposals the contribution of both Western and Eastern Churches should be welcomed. Indeed, the Free Churches of England are in a sense the real "Bridge Church", for they have contacts in the United States more intimate and far-reaching than those of the Church of England.

The verbal agreement which offers but "a spectral unity" is not only inexpedient; it is also disastrous. So Mr. T. S. Eliot contends in *Reunion by Destruction* (Pax House, 1s.), which has in it enough high explosive to blow up not merely the South India Scheme with which it is primarily concerned, but a good many other efforts of the ecclesiastical politicians. To Mr. Eliot the Scheme is "an elaborate artifice", "a pantomime horse", "an amiable masquerade". Its main offence, however, is that it is "a new Church to be erected *upon the foundation* of differences", which would not only separate the Church of England from the Orthodox Churches and exacerbate differences already existing within her borders, but would in the end destroy her.

> The consequences of our acceptance of the South India plan of reunion would be slow in manifesting themselves. Everything would appear to go on just as before: no church would be spoiled of its ornaments, no church would be shorn of its liturgy, no church would have unfamiliar and unacceptable additions or alterations of ritual forced upon it. It is not probable that more intruders would present themselves at the altar, that there would be more brawling in the pews, or interruptions of the sermon. There might even be less: for when it is expressly laid down, that many of the differences among us which have kindled sudden heat, or maintained stubborn dissension, are matters upon which every church member is entitled to his private opinion, what will there be left to brawl about? What occasion will there be to molest others? The peace of death will descend. No liberty need be affected; and so long as men are free to do as they please, they tend to think that all is well.

Meanwhile there are other revealing comments on the South India Scheme. In this country Free Churchmen have generally understood that at the end of thirty years the United Church of South India would be free to determine whether it would accept Episcopacy or not. But now the Rev. Jack Winslow writes to *The Times* to reassure Anglicans, explaining that the Scheme declares at the end of the thirty years the Church is definitely episcopal. That is to say, the "Schemers", if they refuse to accept the "dead hand" of the past, determine now what their successors must do in the thirty years' time: apparently at that time the Church will no

longer believe in the guidance of the Holy Spirit; the date of His superannuation is determined as not later than thirty years after the acceptance of the Scheme.

* * *

FOR *Neo-s* of any Branch.

> The Bishop of Persia [Linton] had some talk with me. He is said to be the most successful evangelist of Moslems that our Church possesses. I asked him what he found to be the element in Christianity which appealed most to the Mohammedans in Persia, and he replied that it was the Person and Character of Christ, *not* conviction of sin. The sense of sin developed in the converts, but it played no part in their conversion. The Bishop of Leicester [Bardsley] said that precisely the same was true of the Japanese converts.

From the Journal of Bishop Hensley Henson at the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

* * *

WE have, perhaps *ad nauseam*, pleaded with preachers for simplicity in their speech, and held up the parables of Jesus as recorded in the Authorized Version as their exemplar. It was therefore with interest that we read in J. H. Muirhead's *Reflections* Mr. Speaker Peel's verdict that John Bright was by far the greatest orator he had heard. Bright once told Peel that the secret of his power was that he spoke so slowly:

> But the proper reply would have been, "No, no, it is because John Bright speaks so slowly, and because of the Biblical simplicity of the words that he uses".

Thomas Guthrie (1803-73) in his *Autobiography* expresses views not dissimilar:

> Having learnt our letters, and some small syllables printed on a fly-sheet of the Shorter Catechism, we were at once passed into the Book of Proverbs. In the olden time this was the universal custom in all the common schools in Scotland, a custom that should never have been abandoned. The book is without a rival for beginners, containing quite a repertory of monosyllables and pure Saxon—"English undefiled". Take this passage, for example, where, with one exception, every word is formed of a single syllable, and belongs to the Saxon tongue—"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it". What a contrast to the silly trash of modern schoolbooks for beginners, with such sentences as, "Tom has a dog"; "The cat is good"; "The cow has a calf"!

How far do modern educationists approve of *Proverbs* as a primer?

Since writing the above we have seen an analysis of Lincoln's Gettysburg Speech, one of the few speeches which will live as long as English is spoken. Of its 272 words, 204 are words of one

syllable, 50 of two syllables, leaving only 18 of three syllables or more.

* * *

We notice, not without regret, that Dr. Lowther Clarke has retired from the post of Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K., which office he has filled with conspicuous success since 1915. Under his leadership the S.P.C.K. has become one of the leading publishing-houses of books dealing with all branches of Christian learning, and scholars in all the Churches have cause to be grateful for his wisdom, foresight, and enterprise. Dr. Lowther Clarke is still at the height of his powers, and we trust that now he will be able to give us some of the fruits of his own thinking and experience: the autobiography of a Christian publisher, especially if he has kept a journal like Bishop Hensley Henson's, should be both informing and entertaining!

Meanwhile the Free Churches should not fail to observe how the S.P.C.K. has overshadowed all their publishing departments. We believe that if a denomination has to go into publishing, half-and-half measures are no good, and it should do the thing properly or not at all. Many years ago we dreamed a dream of the Congregational Press as a publishing centre from which would issue a stream of books which would be notable contributions to learning and a constant stimulus to religious life and thought. The best scholars in the denomination would be at its service, with their fingers on the pulse of the Christian world, prepared to say what books were called for, and the usual technique would be used to get the books to booksellers and readers. In our dream, we even became our own printers, with machines installed in the basement of the Memorial Hall: we urged that the denomination itself had enough printing to ensure that the printing department would not be run at a loss.

All this was regarded as the vapouring of romantic youth. And not only so, it was risky, and the Church of Christ must only do the things that are safe. That, presumably, is why He went to Calvary. The degree of risk, however, was not great, especially with the development of the S.C.M. Press before our eyes.

Years afterwards we saw what the United Church of Canada is able to do through the Ryerson Press. Through its books and publications it is able to multiply the ministry of its churches throughout the Dominion, especially in the sparsely-populated areas, and judicious selection enables it to enter the ordinary publishing field with success: a year or two ago it handled in Canada Dr. A. J. Cronin's *The Citadel* and W. L. Shirer's *Berlin Diary*. A few books of this kind, a new Hymnbook, the *Congregational Church Monthly*, weekly offering envelopes, communion cards, all

the propaganda material the Congregational Union needs for reconstruction and youth developments, the *Congregational Year Book,* the Yearbooks of the County Unions and the Colleges, all printed "by our own printers"—is it just a castle in the air or a gold mine in South America, or is it a call to Christian faith and enterprise? But perhaps we've missed the boat, and the opportunity of a generation ago will not recur. We wonder. In its own limited way Independent Press has served the denomination well during these years, but the success that has attended it merely underlines the possibilities of a bolder policy.

* * *

In our last issue appeared a review of Mr. Jonas Lied's exciting autobiography, *Return to Happiness,* with its account of pioneer work in Siberia and adventures in many parts of the world. We quoted from it a paragraph describing a visit to Whitefield's Tabernacle in 1910, when Dr. Jowett preached, Mr. Alfred Derry offered prayer at the lectern, and afterwards there was tea with Jowett in the vestry. This account, our reviewer remarked, provided "headaches for historians". Mr. Lied considers that this phrase can be construed as casting doubt upon the reliability of his narrative. We have assured him that nothing was farther from the reviewer's intention, that the problem was merely to fit the account into the Whitefield's programme of the time and accommodate it with Jowett's desire to conduct the service himself when he preached. The solution suggested was that the engagement must have been the Men's Meeting on Sunday afternoon; on such an occasion it would be quite usual for someone other than the speaker to offer prayer. Mr. Derry informs us that the occasion *was* the Men's Meeting, and that tea in the vestry was the usual thing. We are most anxious, however, to remove from the mind of the author or of anybody else the impression that the words used cast the slightest reflection upon him or his book in any way whatsoever. They were not intended to do so, and we regret that they should have been thought to do so.

* * *

We would draw the attention of readers to Mrs. Demarest's article within and ask them to take action upon it. It is of major importance now and after the war that contacts be made between individual Britishers and individual Americans. The average Britisher, meeting Americans only in the mass, growls that they are an aggressive, boastful, flamboyant, disrespectful, talkative, gum-chewing crowd; the average American soldier, seeing Britons only in the mass, finds them a slow, snobbish, standoffish, superior, stick-in-the-mud, tea-drinking people, unfriendly and dumb. But when a single American gets to know a single Britisher he finds him "a swell guy" and the American in turn is found to be generous,

hospitable, and warm-hearted. The business of Christian people is to multiply the number of these personal contacts. With millions of Americans in this land it should not be a difficult task. By hook or crook we should all get to know one or two of them and write to their people "back home". A hundred thousand folk doing this might change the history of the world, and 100,000 is setting the figure very low.

* * *

We are sure readers will share our satisfaction in that in 1943 the *Congregational Quarterly* paid its way, even though the profit was only £7. Many people have contributed to this result by securing new subscribers, and one or two laymen have generously sent copies to ministers of their acquaintance. May we suggest that all such ministers try to secure a subscriber in their congregations or elsewhere, so that we may maintain the gain 1943 has brought?

* * *

From America we take two epitaphs:

Ann E.
Wife of Jeremiah Walters.
Died November 16th, 1868.
Aged 68 yrs. 5 mos.

She was a true and faithful wife to each of the following persons:

Enoch Francis
John Sherman
William Hassen
J. Walters.

Beneath this stone, a lump of clay,
Lies Uncle Peter Daniels,
Who too early in the month of May
Took off his winter flannels.
Died in 1746, aged 42 years.

And three of Mr. H. L. Mencken's definitions:

Courtship.—A man pursuing a woman until she catches him.

Grape-fruit.—A lemon that had a chance and took advantage of it.

Genealogist.—One who traces your family as far back as your money will go.

* * *

Honourable (or dishonourable) mention for noting misprints in last issue: The Rev. Arthur Wakelin, Broadway, Worcs.

DISESTABLISHMENT.

By The Right Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D.

I. The centenary of the Liberation Society provides a fitting opportunity for reviewing the great issue which determined its original foundation and has been so importantly affected by its exertions.

In the course of the century, the whole framework of protective privilege, which had been built round the Restoration Settlement, has been, piece by piece, destroyed. No civil disadvantage attaches any longer to Nonconformity, nor does the Anglican citizen gather from the Establishment any civil advantage. The centenary of the Liberation Society recalls a long series of political triumphs, by which the Government of Great Britain has been brought into accord with the principles of genuine democracy. The Establishment no longer violates civic rights, but survives in the ecclesiastical sphere as the privation of ecclesiastical autonomy. By successive enlargements of the franchise every trace of religious character has been removed from the constituencies, and Parliament has been correspondingly transformed. First Anglican, then Protestant, then Christian, then Theist, Parliament is now, so far as its membership is concerned, frankly non-religious. The Jew, the pagan, the agnostic, even the atheist, have taken their places on the benches of the House of Commons by full legal right and by the deliberate choice of their electors. The Establishment no longer advantages even the conforming citizen. By the Enabling Act (1919) he has even been deprived of the tenuous religious influence which he had once possessed in choosing churchwardens and voting in the vestry.

Meanwhile, the de-Christianization of the State has proceeded *pari passu* with a progressive extension of the State's ecclesiastical function. The range of Parliamentary action has expanded as the religious character of Parliament has been destroyed. Marriage and education, to name but two cardinal instances, have been brought within the control of Parliament. Neither has now any stronger hold on the Christian tradition of faith and morals than may be consistent with public opinion as formulated in statutes. The ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown has passed into the hands of the Prime Minister, who may be actually hostile, not only to the Church of England but also to Christianity itself, and who must always reflect the wishes of the majority which keeps him in office. The drift towards socialism, which is plainly affecting the political outlook of the nation as a whole, and confessedly dominates the Labour Party, has enlarged indefinitely the area within which the

State claims to be supreme. When female suffrage was a burning question, it was not uncommon to hear Unionist champions of that cause maintain that, if women possessed the vote, the Establishment would be strengthened, and the danger of war would be greatly reduced. Few will now claim that experience has justified the assumption of that argument, for the Establishment is moribund, and war is being waged on a vaster scale and with greater violence than ever before. Whatever may be the distinctive contribution of female politicians to British public life, it will not be favourable to religious Establishment or secure immunity from war. Indeed, it may not unreasonably be thought that the sensitive conscience of religious women will be more deeply offended by the crude Erastianism of the existing Establishment than the more compromising mind of "the man in the street". Women are naturally prone to "Ultramontanism" in all the Churches.

The significance of the rejection of the Revised Prayer-Book has, perhaps, not been generally appreciated. The discipline, the doctrine, even the worship, of the Church of England—for all these were affected by the proposed changes in the Book, which the House of Commons disallowed—had been shown to be within the control of Parliament. Accordingly, when the House of Commons rejected the Revised Prayer-Book, not once but twice, it not merely disclosed its dislike of the proposed revision, but also asserted its own supremacy over the spiritual society even *in rebus spiritualibus*. The first rejection (15th December, 1927) could be plausibly, and, indeed, was largely, discounted as the untoward and undesigned result of unforeseen circumstances—the opposition, it was said, had been vigorous and able, while the defence had been unexpectedly ill-organized and ineffective. The vote did not really represent the deliberate judgment of the House. The second rejection (14th June, 1928) could not thus be minimized and explained away. The House of Commons then had voted with a clear understanding of what was really involved in its action. It rejected the Prayer-Book because it intended to demonstrate its own spiritual supremacy over the National Church. The *Manchester Guardian* had judged rightly the meaning of the vote when it wrote on the morrow of the first rejection that the Church of England had been "revealed naked and undisguised as a State Religion". "The House of Commons", it said,

> has announced in terms of thunder that the Church of England is an Erastian Church. As such it was set up by the power of King and Parliament; as such it remains, and shall remain today.

II. On the morrow of the crisis there seemed considerable probability that the challenge of the House of Commons would be

met by a clear and resolute refusal by the authorities of the Church of England to acquiesce in a legal status which had been shown to involve such spiritual subordination to the secularized State. The Church Assembly passed unanimously on the motion of the Archbishop of Canterbury the following resolution to which the Bishops had unanimously agreed:

> It is a fundamental principle that the Church, that is, the Bishops, together with the Clergy and Laity, must, in the last resort when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him, and to arrange the expression of that holy faith in its forms of worship.

Dr. Bell in his great *Life of Archbishop Davidson* makes the following comment:

> In reality such a statement, thus delivered by the Archbishop, was a courageous statement for one with Dr. Davidson's past traditions to make at the end of a long life; but it did not go so far as some would have liked, and in particular the Bishop of Durham considered that the fact that it could be accepted by the Bishop of Norwich, the principal opponent of the Prayer Book Measure, deprived it of all vital meaning. The Archbishop read it to the Church Assembly on July 9th (1928). His speech introducing it was ordered to be entered on the minutes.

Had the action of the Church Assembly been followed up by some effort to secure an alteration of the legal Establishment, it is possible (though extremely improbable) that there might have been created in England as there had been already in Scotland, a fictional Establishment of which the true character might better be described as "Disestablishment without Disendowment". The mood of the Church Assembly was, however, as transitory as it had seemed to be determined. The Archbishop's personal influence, which had been greatly increased by admiration for his political sagacity, and sympathy for his unmerited humiliation, was exerted in order to avert the issue of Disestablishment, which had been so clearly raised. Every day that passed strengthened the forces of non-resistance. General feeling in the country was disinclined to undertake a conflict which could not but be protracted and inflaming. Sentiment and political habit reinforced in the minds of ordinary Anglican laity the natural reluctance to abandon that defence of the Establishment which for so many years had been an integral part of the Conservative programme. The prospect of Disendowment, rightly seen to be inseparable in England from Disestablishment, quenched the spiritual ardour of the clergy and aroused their fears. Protestants and Anglo-Catholics had their own reasons for acquiescing without difficulty in the

defeat of a serious effort to restore the reign of law in the ecclesiastical sphere. Their interest in prolonging the anarchy inseparable from the paralysis of the legal system was but too apparent. The politicians were more than willing to tolerate any arrangement which would remove the ecclesiastical conflict from the political arena. The Nonconformists manifested little satisfaction in the triumph of their own principles. Their interest in Disestablishment was declining, and their importance as a political force was, for intelligible reasons, ceasing to retain its old prominence. The dividing lines of party were changing as new issues arrested, and even absorbed, public interest. The Liberation Society no longer awakened enthusiastic response in its own camp. Its victory had been so complete that it seemed to be "flogging a dead horse" when it continued to use the language of conflict. Liberation for Nonconformists was no longer the slogan of the advocates of civic equality. For Anglicans it was becoming the slogan of spiritual independence. The change was too complete to be welcome, too apparent to be concealed. It is not to be wondered at that suggestions of compromise were advanced from more than one quarter, and the hope was indulged very widely that in a revised form the time-honoured Establishment might become tolerable and permanent. Thus it came about that the crisis which had seemed so menacing petered out ignobly in a spate of hollow protestations, and the Establishment survived in an enfeebled but unaltered condition. The Church of England emerged from its defeat still Established, but with lessened prestige and a troubled conscience.

It is probable that the gravity of the crisis had been obscured in many minds by the assumption that the House of Commons could fairly be regarded as representative of the Anglican *laity*, and that, in rejecting the Revised Prayer-Book, it had but exercised that authority within the National Church which does properly belong to the Christian laity in the spiritual society of the Church. This, indeed, had provided the ultimate justification for the personal supremacy of the Christian monarch, which had been transferred to Parliament. The Royal Supremacy, based on the Scriptural precedent of the Jewish monarchy and its character indicated by the ecclesiastical precedents of the Christian antiquity, was certainly more than merely temporal. Constantine and Justinian would have been at home in the English Establishment as it was shaped by Henry VIII and Elizabeth. This is indeed the explicit doctrine of the Anglican Canons of 1604, which still retain authority over the English clergy. Nevertheless, to acknowledge such spiritual supremacy in such an assembly as the House of Commons has now become would imply surrender to the profane Erastianism of Thomas Hobbes, and imperil the essential

character of a spiritual society. The laity, indeed, are an essential element in the Christian Church, and cannot rightly be excluded from their due place in its government. But by the "laity" we do not mean all citizens other than the clergy, but only those who are themselves baptized and confessed members of the Christian Church. "Laity" is as much a religious term as "clergy"; unhappily, a careless practice has grown up of using it as descriptive of all unordained people, and it is now not uncommon to hear the House of Commons absurdly described as representing the "laity".

During the Middle Ages the function of the clergy was both exaggerated and misconceived, so that the laity were shut out from all share in spiritual administration. The medieval view was clearly expressed by the resolution of the Canterbury Convocation which Bishop Bonner, as the acting President, presented to Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign, when her ecclesiastical policy was still vested in obscurity. It declared that authority in faith, sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline belongs to the pastors of the Church and not to the laity. That view was rejected by the authors of the "Elizabethan Settlement", and the establishment of the Church of England, which therein received its permanent form, rests on the assumption that the laity also have a spiritual character, and a measure of spiritual authority. The Royal Supremacy, vested in the Christian monarch, could be fairly regarded as the formal assertion of the rights of the English laity within the spiritual sphere. It was dangerously exaggerated by the Tudors and Stuarts, but no Christian principle is violated by the careful delimitation of the sovereign's authority which is made in the XXXVIIth Article. It cannot possibly be carried to the length of justifying the procedure of the House of Commons in 1927 and 1928. To sum up. The religious basis of the title of Parliament to exercise ecclesiastical functions has been provided, and can only be provided, by its character as the House of Laity in the Church of England. That character was apparent and indisputable until the Toleration Act (1689); it was doubtful but defensible until the Reform Act (1832). It became ever more doubtful and less defensible as successive Franchise Acts completed the democratization of Parliament. But it still survived, and was still defended as "a working anomaly" until the Enabling Act (1919) created in the Church Assembly a new House of Laity, which was definitely Anglican. The Enabling Act was the formal admission by Parliament itself that the anomalous Establishment was no longer "working". Its own implicit claim to be the House of Laity in a National Church was tacitly abandoned, and the new Act was generally welcomed by Anglicans as securing effective spiritual autonomy. It was not generally understood that even measures dealing with unquestionably spiritual matters were still

to be contingent on the approval of the Houses of Parliament as well as measures which dealt with such matters as the creation of new dioceses, and the reorganization of the judicial system. In the agitation of the "Life and Liberty" enthusiasts which carried the Enabling Act, the dominant note was the inherent right of the Church of England as a spiritual society to be effectively autonomous. The famous provision of Magna Carta, *"Sit ecclesia Anglicana libera"*, was continually on the lips of the leaders in that agitation, and, if its precise significance was not generally perceived, its general intention was everywhere emphasized. The Church of England was no longer to lie open to the charge of a guilty Erastianism, but should henceforth be able to face its critics as spiritually independent of the State.

The National Church theory has survived, very unfortunately, in the sphere of education, where the unhappy "Dual System" still reflects its influence and attests its failure. The village school is still commonly styled the "National School" and held under the National Society's Trust, but in tone and temper it has so generally become denominationally Anglican that the children of Non-Anglicans can hardly without injustice be required to attend it. The principles of the Established Church are otherwise understood and expounded in 1944 than they were when the Trust Deed was drafted in 1817. Then they were generally accepted as those of a church which professed that "Protestant Reformed Religion", which, at his coronation, the Sovereign pledges himself to "maintain to the utmost of his power". Now "Protestant" has become a "bad word" in Anglican assemblies.

If Mr. Butler's valiant attempt to make the State education effectively Christian should finally fail, and the grave calamity of a nakedly secular system be forced on the reluctant nation, responsibility for that great disaster will be divided between the hyphenated Catholics and the irreligious section of the school teachers.

III. Defending the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, in 1869, Bishop Thirlwall dwelt on the significance of the transition from autocratic monarchy to modern democracy, and pointed out its bearing on the relations of Church and State[2].

> It is observable that those who maintain the duty of providing for a public profession of religion to be incumbent on the Christian magistrate, commonly build their theory on the hypothesis of an ideal ruler in an ideal State; a ruler invested with absolute power, and governing a people united by the same religious profession. In such a case it is not difficult to show that it is the duty of the ruler to exert his power for the

[2] *Charges*, II, 214, 215.

protection of the interests of that religion which he and his subjects profess. It is on this account that the Church of Rome has always favoured despotic forms of government when administered by adherents of her own faith. The sovereigns who, like Philip II and Louis XIV, wielded their absolute power for the extirpation of heresy, realized her ideal of the perfect State. And this, I think, may serve to allay any regret which we might otherwise feel, when we reflect that such a state of things is visibly and rapidly passing away; that it only lingers in the imperfectly civilized parts of Europe, while in those which represent its highest intelligence and culture it belongs to the irrevocable past. Both as men and as Christians, we have reason to rejoice in this change. But it has evidently introduced new conditions into the question of Church Establishments, which render it much more complicated and difficult, and deprive much of the reasoning which was grounded on that imaginary basis of all force and relevancy. And it may be safely said that there is no country in the world where the difficulty is so great, the problem so complicated, as it is in our own; the seat of a vast empire, extended over a great variety of races and religions, and itself inhabited by a population divided by endless diversities of opinion and belief, and subject to a monarchy so tempered by constitutional restraints, that no small sagacity is required to determine where the centre of power is to be found, and it is only certain that it depends on the concurrence of many subordinate agencies. It is clear that rules of action which under a system of personal government might be binding on the conscience of the ruler, would become utterly inapplicable to a Legislative Body, representing widely divergent religious sentiments, and of masses too large and powerful to be ignored or neglected. The practical neutrality or impartiality which in the one case would have been a fault or a sin, becomes, under altered circumstances, a necessity and an obligation. The zeal which was a duty becomes an error and a weakness.

English Churchmen are coming to think of themselves, less as members of an Established National Church, of which the system and outlook are "cribb'd, cabin'd, and confined" by legal and political fetters drawn from the history of a troubled past, and more as members of the Anglican Communion, spread far over the earth, a great and expanding branch of the Christian family. They are perceiving ever more clearly that the spiritual witness of English Christianity gains by the removal of local checks on its world-wide influence. English Churchmen are turning from ideas and conditions, which have been plainly outgrown, to a future which is rich in possibilities; and they are embracing with waxing enthusiasm that high ideal of ordered liberty within a united

Christian fellowship which they feel themselves divinely called to formulate and pursue.

IV. The present position is ambiguous, for, while the position of the Establishment, as disclosed by the repeated rejection of the Revised Prayer-Book by the House of Commons was justly described by Archbishop Temple in 1928 as "intolerable", it now appears to be regarded by Anglicans as so secure as to provide the assumption on which practical policies may reasonably be based. In short, the Erastian aggression has been acquiesced in, and, as if to seal the humiliating complaisance of the Established Church, two successive Primates on retiring from office have not hesitated to accept from the State the unprecedented compliment of a peerage. It is difficult to understand, impossible to respect, so amazing a revolution of opinion in so short a time.

The Establishment hangs about the Church of England as the dead albatross about the neck of the Ancient Mariner, troubling his conscience and embarrassing his movement. It is universally agreed that the end of the war must necessitate a large reconstruction of national systems—political, social, educational, economic. It is hardly possible, and it is certainly not desirable, that the ecclesiastical Establishment should be exempt from the general process. Indeed, the subject of ecclesiastical reconstruction is agitating the minds of the clergy, because it obviously touches the sensitive point of their own official incomes. The "bitter cry" of the underpaid incumbents, which has been audible for many years, has now reached a tragic intensity, for the war has so worsened their financial position that a practical deadlock seems to be in sight. Vacant livings can with difficulty be filled, and a waxing number of incumbents are unable to continue at their posts. It is perceived, however, that adequacy of income must be associated with adequacy of employment and adequacy of personal quality. The familiar slogan, "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work", is apparently reasonable. It is certain that neither the pay nor the work can be secured so long as the existing parochial arrangements are maintained. Many of the clergy suffer from inadequate employment probably not less than from inadequate remuneration. Both are highly unfavourable to personal quality. The existing parochial arrangements, however, are integral to that immemorial pastoral method by which the special obligation of an Established National Church has been satisfied; and, so long as the national description is claimed and given legal recognition in the Establishment, it is hard to see how that immemorial pastoral method is to be so far set aside as to secure sufficiency of income and employment for the parochial incumbents as a whole.

The ancient endowments, now considerably reduced by recent

legislation affecting tithe rent charge and mining royalties, are confessedly altogether insufficient to provide the minimum income of £500 *per annum* which is now suggested as practically indispensable if the scandal of clerical indigence is to be removed. To some degree the policy of uniting contiguous parishes and pooling their endowments mitigates the situation; but there is a limit to the application of this method, and it is probable that that limit has nearly been reached. Moreover, it is not to be denied that the amalgamation of even contiguous parishes is highly unpopular in the country and does involve appreciable injury to no inconsiderable proportion of the rural parishioners. It is admitted that a vast sum of "new money" must be provided if the hardship and disgrace of clerical poverty are to be removed from the Church of England. The need is national, but it must be met by denominational resources, for the national State has long abandoned responsibility for financing the National Church. It will hardly be disputed by any informed and considering social student that the Church of England as a denomination is quite unable to provide the money for an effective re-endowment of the parishes.

The landed classes with whom the Anglican clergy have from time immemorial been so closely connected, and by whom the work of the Church in the parishes has been mainly supported, are well-nigh ruined by heavy taxation, local and imperial, so that there is little possibility of any considerable contribution to be expected from them. In the last decade of the nineteenth century it was calculated that the clergy of the Established Church received somewhere about £3,000,000 *per annum* from the parochial endowments, and were assessed for income tax at no less than £9,000,000, so considerable was the amount of the private incomes of men who so largely belonged to the comparatively wealthy class. This situation has long passed. Clergymen with private incomes now are rarely found. Every bishop could testify to the poverty of the clergy whom he ordains, and the difficulty which the absence of private clerical incomes has created when the question of appointing incumbents for poorly endowed parishes has to be answered. It is hardly disputable that one factor in facilitating the decline of discipline in the Church of England was the fact that so many of the clergy had been practically working without pay, and therefore were justified in their own eyes when they gave to their official duty a laxer interpretation than law prescribed, and religion required. The far-resounding scandals of pluralities and non-residence had their principal root in the insufficiency of the parochial incomes. The law-breaking of pastoral indolence did not indeed wake such public resentment as the law-breaking of "Ritualist" innovation because it harmonized well enough with the low standard of religious obligation which generally prevailed,

and did not provoke the alarm and dislike of Protestant sentiment.

V. Two practical conclusions would seem to emerge. (i) National reconstruction after the war must include such a revision of the ecclesiastical system as will satisfy the requirements of the religious conscience, and make possible a better application of Anglican resources, in the interest of the religious obligation which belongs to the Church of England as a living branch of the Body of Christ. (ii) Such effective revision of the ecclesiastical system presupposes Disestablishment and Disendowment. Little difficulty will be found in effecting Disestablishment, but Disendowment presents a practical problem, not in itself specially difficult, but associated so closely with devotional sentiment, patriotic tradition and property interests as to require for its satisfactory handling a very high level of public-spirited magnanimity.

Disestablishment by consent ought not to be unattainable. Is it impossible that Disendowment by consent should also be effected? If there be any reality in the frequent and fervent declarations of religious fraternity between Anglicans and Nonconformists which are heard from both camps, it ought to make easy the common pursuit of a political course which would not refuse to the Church of England that considerate treatment in the matter of the endowments and fabrics which, in the case of the Church of Ireland and in that of the Church in Wales, was included in the process of Disendowment. If Anglicans and Nonconformists could come into agreement on the main issue, it would seem not unreasonable to think that the nation would be complaisant, and certainly the interest of ecclesiastical harmony and national Christianity would be greatly advanced. *"C'est le premier pas que coute"*. So long as the Church of England (albeit with a troubled conscience and with paralyzed discipline) clings to the Establishment; and so long as the Nonconformists are unwilling to recognize the claim which the Church of England can advance on the grounds of practical need, equity, and political precedent, to a liberal and even generous consideration in the matter of the endowments and fabrics, it is difficult to imagine that the nation will be prepared to undertake the task of setting the Church of England really free, albeit at a heavy cost of sentiment, devotional and patriotic, and large material interests, to reorganize itself for a more effective and single-minded performance of its spiritual duty.

Such Liberation of the Church from State Patronage and Control would crown the record of the Liberation Society by the greatest of all its triumphs, and give a new reality to the efforts of those Anglicans and Nonconformists who pursue the ideal of effective religious agreement between Christians within the nation, which so urgently demands their wholehearted service.

DON QUIXOTE

By the Rev. GERAINT V. JONES, M.A., B.Litt.

I. A CHRONICLER of the reign of Philip III of Spain tells how one day the king observed from the balcony of his Madrid palace a student on the opposite bank of the Manzanares alternatively reading and laughing uproariously. "That student", said the king, "is either mad or reading *Don Quixote*".

Don Quixote, the First and Second Parts of which were published in 1605 and 1615 respectively, is one of the world's great books. If we were asked to mention the three most representative characters in European literature we should have to include the Spanish knight, the other two, I should imagine, being Hamlet and Faust, each representing the pinnacle of the three great cultures of the West. Goethe possessed an intellect greater than either Shakespeare or Cervantes; Shakespeare knew more about human nature than either of the other two; yet in spite of the great contrasts between these three creative writers and the products of their imagination, there are some similarities. Hamlet dedicates himself to the task of avenging a foul murder, Don Quixote to the righting of wrongs, Faust to the exploration of the ultimate categories of thought and experience. Hamlet's "madness" is crystallized in his love for Ophelia; Don Quixote's in his self-dedication to Dulcinea del Toboso; Faust's *amor intellectualis* in his passion for Helen in Part II. A modern Spanish critic, Señor Ramiro de Maeztu, has enlarged in some detail on the Quixote-Hamlet parallel, seeing in these two figures antithetical contrasts. "Don Quixote", he says, "is the idealist who acts; Hamlet is the idealist who thinks and analyses". Hamlet says:

> The time is out of joint. O cursed spite
> That ever I was born to set it right.

He is a man who seems to be struggling against his destiny, analysing himself until little is left. Don Quixote, on the other hand, says:

> I was born in this iron age to revive the age of gold, or the golden age, as some choose to call it. I am the man for whom fate has reserved the most dangerous and formidable attempts, the most glorious and stupendous adventures. . . . I am he for whom are preserved perils, great deeds, and acts of valour.

Though, like Hamlet, maladjusted to his environment, he welcomes the tasks which are laid upon him, whereas Hamlet tries to escape from them; yet, like Hamlet, he finds his environment too

much for him. They are the two greatest madmen in literature (if they are mad), and in one of them Spain has given to the world of literature its greatest idealist, its greatest Christian, as she has also contributed its greatest egoist and sensualist, the Don Juan Tenorio of Tirso de Molina's comedy, *El Burlador de Sevilla* (*The Jester of Seville*).

II. *Don Quixote* is essentially Spanish in its genius, and yet it has been translated into most if not all of the European languages. It is utterly un-English in its conception, as can be seen by comparing it with the great works of the contemporary Elizabethan-Jacobean age. It is too profound and too religious to be French: compare Cervantes with Rabelais or Voltaire. And a comparison with *Faust* shows how remote it is from the German soul. It is not a compendium of the culture of an age, like the *Divina Commedia*. Byron said of it, quite wrongly: "It was a great book which killed a great nation". Heine characteristically described it as "the mockery of all enthusiasm", without in the least understanding it. The term Quixotic has become a disparaging nickname for anyone who embarks on extravagant expeditions without considering their practicability; in fact all visionaries and idealists are Quixotists. Some of the incidents in the book are among the most famous in all literature: those of the fight with the windmills, the wineskins, and the flock of sheep, for example. "Tilting against windmills" has come to be a proverbial phrase. The greatness of *Don Quixote,* however, cannot be appreciated if it is regarded purely as a humorous book, as a series of accidents and anecdotes enlivened with a sense of fun which to the sophisticated might appear childish. You can say that *Macbeth* is a play about murders, *Lear* a play about a king who went mad; but you have not said much about them in making those statements. In the same way, *Don Quixote* is far more than an account of the delusions suffered by the most Christian and chivalrous knight, Don Quixote, after reading too many medieval romances about knight-errantry.

Fitzmaurice Kelly has warned us "to pay no attention to those who would persuade us to regard it as a well of esoteric symbolism". But Spanish critics would appear to disagree with this distinguished Hispanist, for some of them, including many of the acutest minds in modern European literature, are agreed in perceiving the necessity to penetrate deeply into the possibilities of rich interpretation it offers. Señor Madariaga, that prodigy of bilingualism who has written more important books in English than in his own tongue, has brought his brilliant intellect to operate on the matter in his so far untranslated book, *A Guide to the Reader of Don Quixote;* and one of the greatest of the older gener-

ation of Spanish men of letters, Miguel de Unamuno, has written a profound and most Christian commentary on it; he considers *Don Quixote* to be a great piece of spiritual symbolism and an allegory of mankind's universal hunger for immortality. He brings this out with particular force in the last chapter of his famous book, *The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and Peoples;* and if we read this with that in mind we shall see that the philosophical-religious interpretation of Cervantes' book is not as far-fetched as might at first appear. For Unamuno *Don Quixote* is a great world-book because it penetrates into the ultimate experiences of the national and of the individual soul:

> Philosophy appears to me as expressed in the soul of my nation as the result of an intimate tragedy analogous with the tragedy of the soul of Don Quixote, as the expression of a struggle between the world as we know it according to reason and science, and that which we would like it to be, according to what we are told about it by our religious faith.

We can, of course, read *Don Quixote* purely as an amusing narrative, richly interspersed with Sancho Panza's jests and epigrams, or we can put any construction upon it which comes handy. In parts it is a dull book, but we are under no compulsion to read them. From whatever angle we may approach it it is a great book; trivial things do not live for centuries. And, like all great books, it is not only a mirror of its own time, of the culture which produced it: it is a mirror in which the individual man and humanity as a whole can see their reflection. Because there are so many individual men, you can see in it almost any thing you want to see. If you want to see in it a representation of the imbecility of unpractical idealism, there it is for you. If you want to see in Don Quixote the classical example of Christian chivalry, you can do that too. It is a comic book; it has also its tragic side; and human nature is both comic and tragic. It is a lesson, a warning, a signpost: a lesson to the well-meaning idealist who often does more harm than good, as when Don Quixote interferes with a man beating a boy. When he has departed the man, naturally enough, beats the boy more than ever, and the last state is worse than the first. It is a warning in that it puts us on our guard against approaching the concrete situations of this life in a spirit of unrealistic idealism; a signpost in as much as it indicates that when all is said and done we find the fulfilment of our destiny as persons not in giving acorns to pigs but in seeing visions and dreaming dreams which we believe to be worth translating into fact. The shallow-minded can see in *Don Quixote* a piece of *naïve* caricature; the philosopher can see in it a conflict between unreason and reason, between lofty idealism and the belief in the conservation of high values and a blunt empiricism. The religious can see in it a model

of the man of faith who will not be turned from the object of his belief by the sceptic and the mocker. It is, too, great literature, the product of fancy and imagination, for the people who walk through the book are characters, men of flesh and bone, to quote Unamuno. Don Quixote, Sancho Panza, his wife Teresa, the Barber, the Curate, Samson Carrasco, the good-hearted Maritornes who is no better than she should be, the Duke: these are not colourless puppets, but creations of flesh and blood. I once saw Sancho Panza riding on a mule in a square in Toledo, fat, unshaven, dirty, greasy, with a couple of water-skins slung over his beast's neck. Don Quixote may have been with him, too, had I possessed the vision of the inner eye to discover him. And, after all, where does imagination begin and reality end? Why should fiction be less real than history? Don Quixote deals with this question himself when he discusses with the barber and the curate, who maintain that the giants and knights in the medieval romances were fictitious, the Don maintaining that they were real.

> I have seen Amadis de Gaul with these very eyes. He was a tall, goodly personage, of good and lively complexion, his beard well ordered, though black, his aspect at once awful and affable: a man of few words, slowly provoked, and quickly pacified.

He may on his deathbed renounce the damnable books of knight-errantry, but by then the vision has faded; he has become one with the common ruck of men. In the moments of exaltation these personages were real, just as Don Quixote, on the level of imagination, is real for us[1].

What is the meaning, then, of this book, in which an old man follows the elusive creatures of his imagination, mistakes almost everything for something else, and after many strange adventures is defeated and compelled to abandon his knight-errantry? But before dealing with *Don Quixote* as a piece of spiritual symbolism, as appearance concealing ultimate meaning, one thing should be mentioned. The book has always been and still is regarded as the death-blow to the medieval romances of knight-errantry. During the Middle Ages one major form of literary entertainment was the composition of silly romances, such as *Amadis of Gaul,* which was a textbook of the hidalgo's notion of chivalry, *Palmerin of England,* and the *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto. These interminable romances were usually about Moors and Saracens, wicked enchanters, giants, terrific combats, beautiful heroines, and spotless

[1] This theme is a favourite one of Unamuno's. He deals with it frequently in his *Life of Don Quixote,* in several of his essays, and in the preface to the 1935 Spanish edition of his novel *Niebla* (*Mist*). Calderon's famous play *La Vida es Sueño* (*Life is a Dream*) is a favourite source of quotation. In this matter as in others the great commentator on Cervantes is a true Quixotist.

virtuous knights. They had all one formula, were all after a pattern, and had a large circulation.

The purely literary purpose of *Don Quixote* is to ridicule these books. Whether this is its only purpose it is difficult to say; as I have said, there is far more in it. Cervantes had presumably read all these romances, and may have enjoyed them; otherwise he would not have read so many of them. They were, I believe, about dead in England by the end of the 16th century, and must have been approaching the moment of expiration in France and Spain, where drama was rapidly taking their place as a form of literature, though they were eagerly read by Ignatius Loyola a century before the publication of *Don Quixote*. Throughout the book, too, there are skits on the romantic, florid style of the pastoral novelettes of the day dealing with Arcadian shepherds. Already other types of composition were becoming popular, such as the picaresque novels of Mendoza, the supposed author of *Lazarillo de Tormes,* and of Thomas Nashe, whose *Unfortunate Traveller* is a pleasant counterblast to the pastoral romanticism of Sir Philip Sidney. *Don Quixote* combines both types; it is a meeting place of the old and the new. The immediate pretext was the confounding of the romances; but I am inclined to believe that this was merely a peg on which could be hung the author's profounder symbolism.

III. It is in the First Part that the most famous passages are found, but it is in the second that Cervantes achieves the real greatness of maturity. The underlying structure, which becomes evident at the beginning of the Second Part, is the Don Quixote-Sancho Panza contrast. Señor Madariaga has analysed with great penetration and subtle insight the characteristics of this contrast, which he represents as taking the form of the gradual Quixotization of Sancho and the Sanchoization of Quixote; the pragmatist, the realist, is coloured by idealism, and the idealist is brought closer to the earth. Quixote sees things not as they are to the common man, but as they are in their ultimacy. The particular reflects the universal; the seen is but an appearance of the unseen, the temporal of the eternal. Windmills are not windmills, but giants, living forces. And he is right. Machines are not just machines: they are for us symbols of the destructive demonic power which is liberated by man, and when we fight against them we may be, like Don Quixote, unhorsed, but we are at any rate fighting something more than machines. The two disreputable women outside the tavern are for him damsels outside a castle, and he treats them with the courtesy due to their position. Isn't he right? Everybody should be treated with courtesy, and behind the unprepossessing exterior there may be a personality which can

only be redeemed when you look into the soul beyond. It is at any rate a Christian approach to the problem of man. Don Quixote dedicates himself to the peasant girl Aldonza, and calls her Dulcinea del Toboso. And again he is right. It is by transforming the reality that we know into the ideal which ought to be that we gain our driving force, the spiritual momentum which gives us the power to persist and to endure. Even the Word became flesh. Without this confidence born of our transvaluation of the things that are we cannot prevail against the opposition of the goat-herds, the serving-men, the Sancho Panzas of this world. There is no other way. In the fifteenth chapter of the First Part Don Quixote and Sancho meet a party of carriers, whom the Don attacks: "What a devil of a fine revenge we shall have", says Sancho:

> "They are more than twenty, we are only two; perhaps we're only one and a half". "I am worth a hundred", replies his master.

Of course he is worth a hundred; two hundred, compared with this rabble. But the rabble, true to type, does not think so. It is accustomed to think in terms of numbers, of quantity, of statistical democracy. The Don thinks in terms of quality, of aristocracy of spirit. And who is right? Elsewhere in the First Part Don Quixote addresses the goatherds in language which they cannot understand. Your goatherd may be a good fellow; but he cannot understand a vision which he has never seen, though he can count his goats. He can listen to a cinema organ playing selections from a musical comedy, but not to Bach's *St. Ann Fugue*.

> He held forth to the goatherds, who devoutly listened, but were little edified, because the discourse was not suited to their capacities.

Such is always the fate of the genius and the visionary.

Opposed to the man of vision is the realist, the man of sensations, Sancho Panza[2]. "I was born, Sancho, to live dying, and thou to die eating". He speaks not in high-sounding abstractions, but in concrete terms, in a torrent of proverbs and popular wisdom, in the language of practical life, of things, not ideas or principles. He thinks not of food for the mind but of food for the stomach, not of the values of civilization but of acorns, cowheels, and garlic. He is the mass man. He lives literally from hand to mouth.

> "Dost thou not see that knight that comes riding towards us upon a dapple grey steed, with a helmet of gold upon his head?" "I see what I see", replied Sancho, "and the devil

[2] Musical readers of this article might refresh themselves, if and when they have the opportunity, by listening to Richard Strauss's *Don Quixote*, in which these contrasts are expressed in terms of another dimension, *i.e.*, the musical and abstract

of anything can I spy but a fellow on another grey ass as mine is".

A saying such as "I am in love with her purely by hearsay" is outside the dimension in which Sancho's mind moves. It is his ability to take a commonsense concrete view of life which enables him to carry on, just as idealism is the source of Don Quixote's strength. Sancho sees sheep as sheep, windmills as windmills, inns as inns. And he is right, too. A windmill, after all, is a windmill. A spade is a spade. His philosophy, if we may use the term in this context, is that of the common man.

> "I would be glad to know what I get, be it more or less. A little in one's own pocket is better than much in another man's purse".

He has no use for anything which cannot be apprehended in realistic terms:

> "I have heard our curate preach up this doctrine of loving for love's sake, and that we ought to love our Maker for His own sake, without hope of good or fear of pain; though for my part I would love and serve Him for what I could get".

In a conversation with the Squire of the Wood, while the Don and the Knight of the Wood are engaged in combat, he says:

> "Let our masters fight, and hear of it in another world; but let us drink and live while we may, for why should we strive to end our lives before their time and season, and be so eager to gather the plums that will drop off themselves when they are ripe?"

That is, gather ye rosebuds while ye may. Sancho is the practical hedonist, like most people. He says many things which should belong to the storehouse of popular wisdom:

> The rich man's follies pass for wise sayings in this world. You must not always expect to find bacon where you see the hooks.
>
> Sir, sorrow was never designed for beasts but for man; but yet let me tell you, if men give way to it too much, they make beasts of themselves.

Don Quixote has not the faintest notion of how to deal with realities. His aim, he tells the Barber, is

> only to make the most happy times in which knight-errantry was in its full glory.

The golden age, no matter whether it is in the past or the future: that is the object of Don Quixote's striving. And what is Sancho's aim? He is becoming slowly quixotized: he too must have something more than pigs and onions to live for. He wants an island to govern: something which he can see and deal with. "We have brains enough", he says, "but we want the island". The concrete,

the actual, the realm of politics and practical justice; that is what he is after. None of your unrealizable visions, none of your talk about values and their conservation. Never mind about principles for the renewal of Europe; let us win the war. Let us get on with the job. An island, something tangible, within reach; that is what he wants. And he gets it, whereas his master's quixotic dreams fade away in the glory of the sunlight.

Yet the idealist does not remain untouched by the hard realism of his servant. The children of darkness are wiser than the children of light. Nor does the realism of the servant remain unaffected by the idealism of the master. At the beginning of the Second Part Don Quixote says:

> I find we ought not to give credit to appearances before we have made the experiment of feeling them.

Don Quixote begins to lose faith in himself; Sancho finds himself more eager to gain possession of *his* ideal. The psychological turning-point of the book is the incident in the Second Part in which Sancho pretends to bring Dulcinea to Don Quixote. They go towards the town of Toboso; Sancho goes ahead and tells his master that he has seen Dulcinea—winnowing! But surely Dulcinea cannot winnow! Sancho sends three peasant girls to meet his master, riding on donkeys. He points out how beautiful they are. "Her damsels and she are all one spark of gold; all pearls, all diamonds, all cloth of gold". Don Quixote sees only three country lasses: Sancho asks him why he does not perceive these radiant beauties. "I see nothing", says Don Quixote, "but three wenches upon so many asses". There we have the disillusionment of the visionary. Don Quixote has seen a large building; it is surely the palace where Dulcinea lives. But it turns out to be a church. "We are mistaken, Sancho. I find that this is a church". Previously an inn is as a castle; now it is just an inn, and a church is a church. The ideal is not what the visionary thought it was, though he struggles heroically against his disillusionment and disappointment. From now on the moods of Don Quixote and his squire change. Don Quixote talks less about knight-errantry; he sees that a cat is a cat, even though it may be an enchanted form of something else. It is, at any rate, seen as a cat. The story of the man of thought living in the realm of thought gives place to that of the man of thought living in the realm of action, and of the man of action obtaining his limited but definite ideal. For the Duke gives Sancho the island of Barataria to govern.

When Sancho gets his island and is faced with the practical problems of government he does not devise constitutions or frame general principles of law. He deals in a common-sense way with situations as he finds them. Compare, for example, the long and complicated instructions given to him by Don Quixote in chapter 43

of the Second Part with the way in which he governs. When Sancho solves the problem of the country fellow and the tailor who made, at his own desire, five caps out of a piece of cloth big enough for one cap only, Sancho does not resort to abstract rules, nicely balancing one claim against the other. His judgment is that the countryman shall lose his caps and the tailor his money, and that the caps shall be given to a third party.

> From whence it may be learned that though sometimes those that govern are destitute of sense, yet it pleases God to direct them in their judgment.

Yet Sancho, too, is disillusioned, in spite of his gift for summary jurisdiction. An ideal which is realized, modest though it may be, is too much for him. He gives up his government when he finds the onset of his enemies too much for him. Ideals had, after all, better be left to those who understand them.

> I was not born to be a governor, nor to defend cities from enemies that break in upon them. I know better what belongs to plowing, to delving, to pruning and planting of vineyards than how to make laws and defend countries and kingdoms. . . . Naked I was born, and naked I am at present. I have neither won nor lost, which is as much as to say, without a penny I came to this government, and without a penny I leave it. . . . In short, I experienced all the cares and burdens this trade of governing brings along with it, and I count them too heavy for my shoulders.

Sancho comes and goes; he owes nothing to life, and pays no debts. He has his pride and his own common greatness; he is one of the great common men of European literature.

But it is not simply in this matter of government that Sancho is quixotized. We find hints of it all through the Second Part. In the First Part Sancho cannot understand the language of his master; in the Second his wife Teresa has difficulty in understanding both his language and his aims. Don Quixote corrects Sancho; Sancho corrects Teresa. This intimate parallelism, which can only be suggested here, is one of the most subtle and significant things in the book. For example, Sancho describes his master thus:

> He has not one grain of knavery in him; he is as dull as an old cracked pitcher, hurts nobody, does all the good he can do to everybody; a child may persuade him at night that it is noonday, and he is so simple that I cannot help loving him with all my heart and soul, and cannot leave him in spite of his follies.

And Don Quixote speaks of Sancho to the Duke in the following manner:

> Sometimes he comes out with such sharp simplicities that one is pleasantly puzzled to judge whether he be more knave

> or fool. The varlet is indeed full enough of roguery to be thought a knave; but then he has more ignorance, and may be better thought a fool. He doubts all, yet believes all. . . . In short, I would not change him for any other squire, even with the addition of a whole city, and therefore I doubt whether I ought to send him to the government which your grace has for him.

So far, then, the story is that of the disillusionment of the man of thought in the presence of brute facts; and also of that of the man of action when obliged to translate into action his limited thought. Cervantes, however, takes us further. He does not leave Don Quixote and Sancho at the moment of their disillusionment. He shows us how they act in their disillusionment. Don Quixote is shattered by the shock of mere physical defeat at the hands of Samson Carrasco, and, full of sorrow at having to promise to abandon his knight-errantry, he returns to his home, where he dies in a moment of mental lucidity. His vision fades, and there is nothing to support him. The visionary cannot live without his ideal.

And Sancho? Sancho the squire, the realist, finds that his ideal makes too great demands upon him, and he returns to his pigs and his wife. In one case the man of vision finds reality too great for him; in the other the realist finds the vision too overpowering, but easier for him to return to *his* proper sphere.

That, as I see it, is the underlying structure of this Spanish classic which belongs to the world's great books. It is the story of a great faith and a great failure. Don Quixote's deeds and ambitions were such as would bring few thanks and little joy: they were encounters "where little is to be got besides a broken head and the loss of an ear", in Don Quixote's words. There are no rewards in calculable terms for those who set out with an idealist. "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of and to be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with?" For Don Quixote these encounters by the road were more than encounters: they were the type of something ultimate. The sons of Zebedee wanted to sit on the right and the left hand of the Master in the kingdom; they did not think about the broken head or the loss of an ear. Nor did Sancho, who also wanted, not a kingdom, but at least an island, to govern. Don Quixote has other ideas, however:

> So, my Sancho, since we expect a Christian reward, we must suit our actions to the rules of Christianity. In giants we must kill pride and arrogance; but our greatest foes, those whom we must chiefly combat, are within.

In a word, *Don Quixote* is a great Christian epic. In one of his discourses the knight says:

> The supreme being, that is infinitely above all things, bestows His blessings on us so much beyond the capacity of all other benefactors, that all the acknowledgement we can make can never hold proportion to His goodness.
>
> Of all the sins that men commit, none in my opinion is so great as ingratitude, though some think pride a greater. . . . Ever since I have had the use of reason I have employed my utmost endeavours to avoid this crime; and if I am not able to repay the benefits I receive in their kind, at least I am not wrong in real intentions of making suitable returns; and if that be not sufficient, I make my acknowledgements as public as I can; for he that proclaims the kindnesses he has received shows his disposition to repay them if he could.

Or again:

> Truly I am afraid thou art no good Christian, Sancho: thou never forgettest injuries.

Unamuno has called *Don Quixote* a most Christian epic. It is, but it possesses a significance deeper even than this. It is the symbol of the more than human, of something more profound and fundamental than philosophy. Don Quixote did not fight for ideas alone. He fought for the spirit. All quixotism, Unamuno continues, is mad, whether speculative, meditative, or practical. "It is the child of the madness of the cross", and for this reason it is abhorred by philosophy which, at bottom, cannot tolerate Christianity. Hence the opposition between Christianity and culture, for the realm of values represented by each is different. "That which man seeks in religion", says Unamuno,

> in religious faith, is to save his own individuality, to eternalize it, something which cannot be achieved through science, art, or morality. Neither science, nor art, nor morality can drive us to God; the only thing which can do that is religion.

And religion, as he has pointed out in his great book, *The Tragic Sense of Life,* from which this quotation comes, is concerned with the "hunger of immortality". Don Quixote was animated by this hunger. Comparing the object of his chivalrous self-dedication with the other great representations of the eternal feminine in the literature of the West, Unamuno says:

> For what does Don Quixote fight? For Dulcinea, that is for glory, for life, for what is beyond life. Not for Isolde, who is the eternal flesh; not for Beatrice, who is theology; not for Margaret, who is the people; nor for Helen, who is culture. He fights for Dulcinea, and he succeeds, because she is life.

Quixotism is the spirit which will not be put off by the objections and criticisms of the common man. Even when challenging the caged lion Don Quixote paid no heed to the danger which threatened him. It happened, of course, that the lion behaved

like the lion in Shaw's play about Androcles: it gaped, yawned, licked its face, turned over, and "after he had looked about him for a while, turned his tail, and showing Don Quixote his posteriors, very contentedly lay down again in his compartment".

It is the quixotist who ignores such dangers, who treats them as unreal things. It is the quixotist, too, who refuses to accept the standards of the common man, for he is guided by faith, not by caution and pragmatism. *Don Quixote,* then, embodies an aspect of the culture of Europe which has eluded other great creative minds of the West. Whereas Shakespeare deals with the problem of man in his entirety, and on a humanistic basis, plunging into the dark places of the soul, Goethe with man whose longing for culture and human knowledge is insatiable, and Dostoievsky with the psychological analysis of man as one caught up by the demonic forces of evil and freedom, Cervantes provides us with a picture of man compounded of faith and spiritual adventure, living for a realm of values which are opposed to popular or scientific rationalism, which in fact elude its examination because they belong to a different dimension. In Pauline terminology, he is the spiritual man, Sancho is the natural man. Shakespeare and Goethe represent the humanist spirit of Europe at its highest: Cervantes, a product of Catholic Spain, is the exponent not only of the Spanish spirit but of the spirit and culture of Christendom.

That is why *Don Quixote* belongs to the stuff and structure of the West, and why it remains part of our Christian heritage.

The Rev. Henry Isham Longden has been fortunate in his biographer, for Miss Joan Wake's *A Northamptonshire Rector* (Archer & Goodman, 5s.) is all that the memoir of a "Scholar, Sportsman, Priest" ought to be. Northamptonshire has set an example to other counties in the way it has cherished and used its records, and one of Longden's main interests was history as mediated through wills and parish records: his fifteen volumes of *Northamptonshire and Rutland Clergy from 1500* are a mine for students. Hunting was the Rector's hobby, and there is a good portrait of him mounted. We hoped, vainly, for some sign in the book that there were, or had been, Nonconformists in the county, some of them not undistinguished in Longden's field—research, we mean, and not hunting!

Mr. Maurice W. Thomas's *The English Heritage: Our Law and Central Government* (Nelson, 5s.) is in the "Charter for Youth" series, and it is admirably adapted to the "Sixth Forms" and intelligent youths to whom it is addressed. The jacket, which only contains the first three words of the title, is misleading, but the text itself forms a useful introduction to the subject.

SPIRITUAL HIKING

By the Rev. A. E. Snashall.

Hiking, I have just read, somewhat to my surprise, maintains its popularity even after four years of war. When peace comes it can safely be prophesied that tens of thousands now in the Forces will resume the practice which gave them joy aforetime: route marches will not destroy the love of hiking.

There are three very ancient things, as Mr. Belloc has reminded us: a fire; a roof; a road. The road is probably the most ancient. It is certainly the most intriguing. By the fire men cook their food, guard themselves in the darkness from prowling beasts, signal from hill to hill, gather round it to listen to their sagas and sing their folk songs. Beneath the roof are enacted the tragedies and comedies of life; and there the joys and sorrows and intimacies associated with family life are experienced. But the road! What incalculable possibilities of adventure it affords! How its "long, long trail" calls to the stout heart, the open eye, and the spirit of romance in man!

The spiritual hiker is, of all souls, the most adventurous. Each one of us is conscious of outstanding impulses. There is the urge to rest, to seek safety. There is also the urge to go on, expressing itself in the love of travel and the willingness to take risks. The desire for rest expresses itself in the form of settling down and building a house for oneself. It becomes, with some people, the compelling force of their lives. It expresses itself in the ambition to obtain a bit of property—something that one can get hold of—real estate. How cleverly and devastatingly this home-building urge and its consequences are worked out in Mr. Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga*. We get the expression of this urge, on a more limited scale, in Tennyson's *Northern Farmer,* with its reiterated emphasis on property:

Proputty, proputty sticks, an' proputty, proputty grows.

"Property" became the fetish of Mid-Victorian prosperity. It gave a man his social standing and his home its apparent stability. In his zeal for acquiring property, many a man has turned a deaf ear to the ancient warning: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room . . . of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant". It is a costly impulse. It so often ends in tragedy, as it did with Soames Forsyte musing in Highgate Cemetery, that great dustbin of Victorian gentility in dissolution: "And now the State would have his investments, his woman herself, and God

knew who had his soul". An extreme illustration, but the acquisitive impulse tends to extremes.

On the other hand, there is that in us which cannot settle down, a Divinely-implanted restlessness, that craves always "the glory of going on". It longs for the open road, the romance of adventure. It dreams dreams and sees visions, and seeks its satisfaction in things that cannot be priced and ticketed in sales catalogues, because they are as immeasurable as the rainbow and defy the descriptive powers even of an auctioneer. It reaches out into the ever-expanding realms of poetry and art, music and religion, and gathers those intangible treasures of the Spirit that are "without money and without price".

The Industrial Revolution, with its enormous material developments, its impressive monuments of human enterprise and skill, and its vast store of calculable and purchasable things, has obscured our vision of the eternal, as the smoky atmosphere of the Black Country has blotted out the glory of the heavens. It is hardly wonderful if we have lost the sense of eternity and become the victims of time and circumstance. Mr. Walter Lippmann, in *A Preface to Morals,* declares

> no mariner ever ventures upon a more uncharted sea than does the average human being born in the 20th century. Our ancestors thought they knew their way from birth to all eternity, we are puzzled about the day after to-morrow.

There is truth in that statement, but not nearly as much as Mr. Lippmann thinks. It is not such an entirely new situation as he suggests. Who but the foolishly cocksure has ever been certain about the day after tomorrow? He knows not what a day may bring forth in the great adventure of life. Furthermore, is it altogether a bad thing to find oneself on an uncharted sea, or in a country where there are no guide-books, sign-posts or mile-stones? Has not a good deal of the tameness and mediocrity of life been due to the fact that we have wanted to keep our course within the well-buoyed and brightly-lighted channels of conventional thought and practice, or to travel along the beaten path, where there is no possibility of losing one's way? Mr. Lippmann seriously underestimates two important characteristics of human nature—the latent courage that is in man's heart, a courage which has sent mere lads out from the school playground, from behind the counter and from the sheltered home, to do the most daring and heroic things; and the ineradicable love of adventure that is in man and that drives him forth, like Ulysses—

> Wandering from clime to clime
> On stormy seas unnumber'd.

It is this love of adventure and enterprise that makes a man or

woman a spiritual hiker. From early days, as the individual began to break through the tribal frontiers with more or less safety, human thought tended to widen its horizon beyond the one social structure of the tribe that it had hitherto known. The individual meets with strangers by the way, as he moves out into the larger world and meets them in a spirit of inquiry. He comes back with widened knowledge and a larger sympathy born of experience. By this fresh contribution he helps his fellows to think beyond the tribal point of view. The story of religion is one of continual departures from the narrow outlook and fixed routine of tribal life.

There is a world of wisdom in Richard Jefferies's advice: "always get over a stile". Leave the worn high-road, with its well-marked route, its easy gradients and crowded side-walks, for the unknown. The foot-path may take us down into the Slough of Despond, but eventually it will bring us out upon some mount of vision.

The advice holds good of intellectual research and spiritual inquiry. It is this readiness to leave the high-road of custom and precedent that gives us the investigator in science and philosophy and the religious pioneer. We want "more life and fuller", and it is along the way of spiritual enterprise that men and women keep their secret tryst with God and come to discover the fullness of life:

> A Motion and a Spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.

Each of us is called upon to travel along his own foot-path. It is our individual experience that, capitalized, gives to the race its wide range and variety of knowledge. The spiritual hiker, unlike the specialist, has an unrestricted field of inquiry. He can get over the stile and tread with confidence three paths.

I. The Footpath of Faith.

Professor A. N. Whitehead, one of the greatest of living mathematicians and one of the most original thinkers, remarks:

> Both in nature and in human history there is a constant change, movement, readjustment. The very restlessness of racial movements seems to have a meaning. Races early began to migrate. Why? It is not enough to say they sought better living conditions. There was also an element of risk, of adventure, of faith even in such migrations, the stirring of an impulse which cannot be explained merely in terms of the preservation of life. Mankind has wandered from the trees to the plains, from the plains to the sea-coast, from climate to climate, from continent to continent and from habit to habit of life. When man ceases to wander he will cease to ascend in the scale of being. Physical wandering is still important, but

> greater still is the power of man's spiritual adventures—adventures of thought, adventures of passionate feeling, adventures of æsthetic experience.

There is always a way for the man or woman of faith who is prepared to go forth believing, as John Robinson did, that God has "more light and truth to break forth out of His holy Word", and that Truth is a much bigger thing than any form or creed in which men seek to localize, and so circumscribe, it. It means the stepping off from the well-defined out into the unknown. Faith is not blind. It is a very courageous virtue. There was in Jesus an *élan*, an out-reaching spirit, that was prepared to leave the old Mosaic High-road, so long trodden by the people of God, and to seek the great adventure in the religion of the Spirit. He swung completely free from the tradition of His people by revealing to men that "God is Spirit", and "men must worship Him in spirit and in truth".

He challenged men with His great demands: "Love God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength": "love thy neighbour as thyself": "love your enemies". A religion not to be arrived at by argument, but realized in its strength and beauty by men and women whose faith was brave enough to put it to the test in real life and action. This is the "more excellent way" of reverence and conciliation that rulers and authorities have got to take if they would reach a solution of their multitudinous and varied problems. Have faith as a grain of mustard seed, *i.e.*, a faith that is really alive, and all things are possible. There are men and women who have ventured all on Christ, who have faced, as did the Pilgrim fathers and mothers, almost incredible dangers and hardships, and who can say of these sufferings as did William Brewster:

> It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage or small discontentments cause to wish themselves home again.

Out of that spiritual hike into the unknown has come all that is soundest in the American constitution and finest in the character of its people. If any man would venture beyond the well-defined limits of the known, the customary, and the secure, if he would seek not "safety first", but "the secret place of the Most High", then he must be prepared to go forth, like Abraham and Paul, not knowing whither he goes, sure only of this, that an authentic call has come to his soul which he dare not refuse. It is such a Spirit of Faith that inspires a man to say:

> . . . If I stoop
> Into a dark tremendous sea of cloud,
> It is but for a time: I press God's lamp
> Close to my breast; its splendour, soon or late,
> Will pierce the gloom: I shall emerge one day.

II. The Footpath of Life.

The Christian man and woman has the pull of all others here. Jesus never thrust the warning notice, "Trespassers will be prosecuted", across the path of any true knowledge, any pure pleasure, any genuine art.

The value of spiritual hiking is that it sets us free from stuffiness in our religious life, due to that ingrained conservatism which clings to constant repetitions and the tendency to formalism and literalism. It saves us from the dangers of behaviourism and dilettantism by giving our soul the right direction, the high enterprise, and the possibility of an unending variety of religious experience: "anywhere, if only it be forward!"

Spiritual hiking saves us from an unduly introspective religion, from spiritual fussiness, and from that superficial knowledge of men and things and God which are the unsatisfying results of the modern tendency to spread ourselves over too many interests. Of all the calls to adventure, to go along the unfolding way of life on its highest level, the call of Christ is morally the most authoritative, and obedience to it is spiritually the most enriching. Martin Luther left the shrine-bedecked high road of Roman Catholic doctrine and practice and got over the stile that led into the freer thought, the fresher air, the wider prospect of Protestantism. John Wesley left the hard, broad way of rationalistic Deism, and got over the stile, on to the hills of God, where he felt on his soul the breath of that vital Spirit which, presently, was to sweep through the valley of dry bones to which rationalism had reduced the religious life of England, and cause them to stand upon their feet, "an exceeding great army", "alive unto God"! In the days between the Wars men like Barry and Streeter and Quick left the main thoroughfare of Materialism, with its imposing structures, that "catch the eye and have the price". Crossing the stile, they showed how all the by-paths of knowledge lead up to the Incarnate, Crucified and Risen Christ, how human thought and life are unified in Him, as the Eternally Living Embodiment of all Truth and Beauty. So men, walking along the footpath of life, find that what Tintoretto said of the sea is true of Jesus Christ: He "grows always greater".

III. The Footpath of Death.

The spiritual hiker knows that the high-road of this earthly life is closed by a *cul-de-sac* with a hole at the end. Before his body reaches it, his spirit steps off the old road and over the stile, into the green pastures and beside the still waters that lead on and into the valley of the shadow. But as the spirit travels it fears no evil. There is a table prepared for it, and new experiences await it. "Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die". It is a

wonderful picture that Sir James Barrie draws of Peter Pan, alone on the lagoon. He is standing on a rock. The sea is slowly rising all round him. The rock is getting smaller and smaller. A few more minutes and there will be no Peter Pan left. What about it? The story goes on:

> Peter was not quite like the other boys, but he was afraid at last. A tremor ran through him, like a shudder passing over the sea. Next moment he was standing alert again, with that smile on his face and a drum beating within him. It was saying: "To die will be an awfully big adventure".

Peter Pan had got the hang of things. For the materialist, death means the end. For the rationalist death means the end, so far as his unaided reason can take him. He forgets that he is living in a universe that his unaided reason did not create and cannot control or explain. All that is best, even in rationalism, is due to what the spiritual hikers of the ages have contributed to thought and life:

> All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good.

When the end comes here, the most reasonable conviction, based on faith and experience, is that we are only on the threshold of a new venture. You do not build and equip a great liner in order to run it between Richmond and Greenwich.

> Truly there needs another life to come!
> If this be all—
> And other life await us not—for one
> I say 'tis a poor cheat, a stupid bungle,
> A wretched failure. I, for one, protest
> Against it, and I hurl it back with scorn.

Browning shows the contrast in *A Grammarian's Funeral.* The one man is given up to the pursuits and rewards of this world. The other seeks the non-material.

> That low man seeks a little thing to do,
> Sees it and does it.
> This high man, with a great thing to pursue
> Dies ere he knows it.
> That, has the world here—should he need the next,
> Let the world mind him!
> This, throws himself on God, and unperplexed
> Seeking shall find Him.

His scholars bear their master's body to a mountain summit to give it fitting burial, singing as they go. In a moment of sublime conviction they declare: "He's for the morning!" And what a morning! "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of a man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him". Because that is so, the soul in man sets its course unerringly towards the unseen. It meets Death's challenge with a clear eye and a high purpose. In the Poet Laureate's words:

My Road calls me, lures me
West, east, south, and north;
Most roads lead men homewards,
My Road leads me forth—

not to escape from life and action towards an eternal quiescence or a complete extinction. There are musical critics who tell us that Beethoven's later works were his greatest: there is in them

> a mystical enquiry, a mystical hope. Taking the wings of beauty, he passes the gates of death, and like the lark in the darkness before the dawn, ventures upwards and onwards still singing as he searches for a more perfect day.

For him, as for all brave, trusting, adventurous souls, "Mortality is swallowed up of life". They follow Him, the greatest of all adventurers, Who, coming from heaven to earth, passed through the darkness of death, on and up into the Eternal Life, and Whose word to the following soul is final:

Because I live, ye shall live also.

Mr. Michael de la Bedoyere's *Christianity in the Market-Place* (Dakers, 6s.) is an admirable book which may get its author into trouble. Its author is gratified by the fact that as a lay Catholic he has been allowed in his weekly paper to write without coming into conflict with authority. His immunity is likely to be short if he continues to proclaim the pure Protestantism of this book, with its emphasis on the individual, the right of individual judgment, and the need of ndividual witness. True, Mr. de la Bedoyere drags in authority and the Papacy at regular intervals, but the individual is central in his exposition. Indeed, had he used Christian instead of Catholic throughout the book as he does in the title, there would have been little in it with which Protestant Christians who believe in catholicity would desire to quarrel. It is indeed true that the supreme need of the hour is for Christians to be a monstrance, though we prefer to use the words of Jesus, "Let your light so shine before men". See Worth Noting.

Mr. John Cranstoun Nevill's *Harriet Martineau* (Muller, 5s.) is such a bright and readable piece of work that we shall open his next work with eagerness. He has told a familiar story in such a way that the reader cannot lay the book down once he has started it. Did anybody ever try to make a bibliography of Harriet Martineau's writings? And did any woman so handicapped ever write so much, and so much that was good?

Mr. L. J. F. Brimble and Mr. F. J. May have to cover a tremendously wide field in their "Sociological Approach to Education", *Social Studies and World Citizenship* (Macmillan, 6s.). They consider politics, civics, the arts, literature, science, music, religious instruction, history, geography, physical education, to say nothing of Esperanto, about which we have a good deal. Any eight consecutive items in the Index shows the range of the book—*e.g.*, New Zealand, Nicodemus, Nigeria, Night Emissions, Nightingale Florence, Nijinski, Nils, Norman Times. The authors have much that is sound to say, and teachers especially should gain help from their survey.

A CONVINCING LIFE

By JOHN ARCHER.

NORTHAMPTON Congregationalists have a special interest in their General Hospital, which attains the bi-centenary of its foundation on 27th March. It must surely be unique in the circumstances of its inception, for it owes its origin to the collaboration of the saintly Dr. Philip Doddridge and an avowed atheist, Dr. James Stonhouse.

Stonhouse, the son of a Berkshire squire, first settled at Coventry, but finding it impossible to build up a paying practice there, he migrated to Northampton in April, 1743, bringing with him his wife, a young lady of 20, daughter of a member of Parliament, and a Maid of Honour to Queen Caroline. He was 26. Being a man of much energy and somewhat impetuous, he was not content simply to wait for patients; he sought them among the poor who could not afford to pay him; indeed he never intended that they should.

What we now know as the important centre of the boot and shoe industry was at that time a little country town of some five thousand inhabitants, and very naturally in so small a place Dr. Stonhouse soon came into contact with Doddridge, then minister of Castle Hill Meeting. Despite his kind disposition, young Stonhouse was an atheist, and in his youthful zeal he wrote what he afterwards alluded to as "a wretched little work" against Christianity. Doddridge described him as "a most abandoned rake and audacious deist".

Whatever Stonhouse professed, his constant attendance on the poor and afflicted proved that he was a better man than he knew, and although he was regarded with suspicion and distrust by the good religious people of his day, Doddridge made no attempt to avoid him. As a matter of fact, he was rather attracted to this energetic young doctor. They gradually became firm friends, and the doctor of divinity was not long in discovering that the doctor of medicine was not half as black as some people painted him.

Stonhouse, on his part, writing to a medical friend early in the year after he came to Northampton, says somewhat guardedly, "I am very unhappy for want of what I call a friend. Dr. Doddridge is sincerely so, but I cannot be much seen with him on account of my interest. He is indeed a sensible man and promotes my business".

The friendship between this strangely-assorted pair gradually ripened, and before long they were engaged in a tremendous joint enterprise—the establishment of a hospital, of which there were

then only one or two outside London. Which of them first thought of the project no one can say definitely, but one thing is certain, that the great and beneficent institution which today holds an eminent place among the first seven provincial hospitals in the country owes its inception to their determined and spirited joint action.

The first thing to do was to arouse interest in the scheme and then to raise funds. Neither was any easier to do then than it is now. But Doddridge had set his heart on the undertaking. He enlisted the support of his good friend the Earl of Halifax (in whose Northampton house the Academy was housed); he wrote letters to the leading noblemen and gentlemen of the county asking for gifts; he saw the magistrates on the Grand Jury at the Assizes; he induced the Mayor to make a public appeal; and, in order to impress his own people at Castle Hill and religious people generally, he preached a sermon in furtherance of the scheme. He chose a most appropriate text: "Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble, the Lord will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing. Thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness" (*Psalm* 41). 2,500 copies of the sermon were afterwards printed and sold in aid of the hospital. The Earl of Halifax arranged a public dinner to which friends of the institution were invited. The festivities proceeded very happily for some time until someone rose and proposed what is described as "an unbecoming toast". Doddridge immediately got up from the table, placed a guinea in the hands of a waiter to defray his share of the extra charges of the evening, and walked out. The circumstance caught the eye of Lord Halifax, who publicly remarked, "There goes a gentleman and a Christian".[1]

Money was hard to obtain, and Doddridge writes:

> We have taken a house for the hospital. Our subscriptions amount to more than £600 but I fear the distant parts of the county will do nothing considerable. Were not Lord Halifax and Mr. Jekyll so hearty in the cause I should still expect that the design for the hospital would drop. The clergy are strangely backward . . . for with some men even charity grows odious when recommended by a dissenter.

But eventually the promoters felt justified in proceeding with the good work, premises were rented, and on 27th March, 1744, in quite a small way was started that wonderful institution now known throughout the county of Northamptonshire. There were 40 beds then. Now there are 400. Dr. Doddridge was elected first chairman of the "Weekly Committee", and Dr. Stonhouse

[1] This incident was related to Doddridge's great-grandson (John Doddridge Humphreys, editor of the *Correspondence and Diary*) by the doctor's last surviving pupil, the Venerable Rev. Thomas Taylor.

was appointed physician and a governor; he became very popular with the patients, and it was not long before he was recognized as the leading physician of the county.

Up to this time he had not been inside a place of worship. How he came to do so is an intensely interesting story. In his professional capacity he was attending a lady who realized that her days were numbered. Shortly before she died she called Doddridge and Stonhouse to her bedside. Her last wish was that Doddridge would preach her funeral sermon and that Stonhouse would consent to go and hear it. Very reluctantly and with much misgiving Stonhouse promised. The lady died, Doddridge preached the sermon in Castle Hill Meeting House, and, as in honour bound, Stonhouse was there. There can be little doubt Doddridge regarded the circumstance as a heaven-sent opportunity and improved the occasion. Dr. Stonhouse was impressed, and he walked home in a very contemplative frame of mind. Next Sunday morning, while Doddridge was conducting service as usual, he noticed what probably no one else saw. A tall, familiar figure slipped very quietly inside the door and stood behind one of the two massive pillars which then supported the roof. At the close of the sermon the visitor crept out as unobtrusively as he had entered. This happened on two or three Sundays. It was Dr. Stonhouse, and not long afterwards he became a worshipper, sometimes at Castle Hill and on other occasions at St. Giles' Church, in which parish he lived. He renounced his infidelity and became as enthusiastic in the cause of religion as he was in medicine. Writing many years later he says: "The exact date of my conversion to Christianity is not known, but the blessed instrument employed by God for effecting this great work was Dr. Doddridge". Doddridge himself refers to it as "One of the most signal instances in which God has ever honoured me".

After his conversion the spiritual welfare of his patients became to Stonhouse as important as—if not more important than—their physical health. He began to deliver religious addresses in the wards of the hospital, and he used his pen to the same good end in a pamphlet, *Friendly Advice to a Patient,* which ran through thirteen or more editions and was taken up by the S.P.C.K. As late as 1815 (67 years after it was written) a large number of copies were purchased by the Hospital Governors for distribution among the patients.

A letter to his friend Dr. Swan, of Newcastle-under-Lyne, indicates how complete is the change in his outlook. He writes:

> Have you yet bought Dr. Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion*? The third edition comes out in July. You *must* buy it. There is not one to be got now. I have given away

15 of them and intend occasionally to give another dozen when I can do it without the affectation of a religioso. I hate the appearance of being sanctified or tinged with enthusiasm.

Five days later he sent Dr. Swan a copy of the *Family Expositor*.

Three months afterwards Stonhouse pens the most remarkable tribute to Doddridge that has ever seen the light. And it must be remembered that it is in a letter from one doctor to another—from a professional man accustomed continually to seeing his patients in pain and familiar with their varied reactions to illness:

> Dr. Doddridge is now my patient, confined to his bed by a bad fever—should he die, his loss to his large family, to the Academy, to the town, to the world, to the poor, and to me in particular, would be inconceivable to you who are a stranger to his benevolence and unaffected thirst after generous actions. His resignation to his Creator, his patience under violent pains of the bowels, frequent vomiting and difficulty of breathing astonish me. No canting or whining, but a decent composure and genuine cheerfulness. No hasty words to anyone about him, but a settled, glorious tranquillity. Is not this man even at this moment of horror, greater than ever Alexander was in his triumphant entrance into Babylon? I may say of Dr. Doddridge as Cato does of his son, "Who would not be that man?"

In 1764, at the age of 47, Stonhouse exchanged the cure of bodies for the cure of souls. He relinquished his practice, took Orders in the Church of England, and was appointed to the rectory of Great and Little Cheverel, in Wiltshire. As a preacher it is recorded that "he was without a rival. His eloquence was simple, grand, and energetic. He convinced the mind while he warmed the heart".

Mr. H. N. Dixon, M.A., F.L.S., the veteran leader of Northampton Congregationalism, puts the position succinctly in the following words:

> "Organized religion" has become of late years a term almost of reproach on the lips of some who speak more readily than they think. No better refutation of the implied criticism is needed than to point to our own fine block of Hospital buildings and all the ministry of healing they represent, and the many magnificent halls of healing scattered up and down our country; and to recall that they are all primarily owed to the devotedness of the Nonconformist minister of Castle Hill, and of the medical student who came to Northampton an overt unbeliever, and who became, through Doddridge, a professing Christian and a minister of the Gospel.

OURSELVES

By H. R. Chillingworth, M.A.

I used to wonder how the people of the Dark Ages regarded the Romans whom their ancestors had dispossessed. Were they aware that their ancestors had been barbarians and that they themselves were little better? The creations of Mediterranean civilization had not all disappeared. Temples and aqueducts and many of the great roads must have still existed, and from south-eastern Europe there must have come descriptions of Byzantine magnificence. But I do not think that the evidence of past greatness or vague tales of foreign splendour can have made any deep impression on the medieval mind. The living dogs were then, as always, much better than the dead lions; at any rate, they were much better known. Bede in the seventh century may have had an inkling of the relations of his barbaric age to the great ages of Rome and Greece; and Abelard, though he was four hundred years farther from those ages, probably had much more than an inkling. But the mass of the people can have had no notion at all of the civilization which their ancestors destroyed, and even the great ones of the time were unable to appreciate it. *They* were the people, and wisdom would perish with them.

The flattering conceit was no doubt partly due to the existence of the Papacy, "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof". The churchmen, after Hildebrand's time at least, did not stand before kings with bated breath and whispering humbleness. The weapons of their warfare may not have been carnal; but, with Heaven to offer as a prize and Hell to threaten as punishment, they were able to do more than hold their ground against kings and barons. Even in the days of their humility, belief in the incomparable superiority of Christianity to all other creeds must have enabled them to keep their heads high. The Romans may have been first-class fighting men, but they were poor benighted heathen for all that.

We recognize greatness, but, to appreciate it, we must ourselves be great. A dog knows that his master is bigger and stronger than he is, but how much bigger and stronger, he has no means of judging. His standards are too vague and fleeting. Our standards are better defined, but we do not apply them Fear of making discoveries unflattering to our vanity prevents us from comparing ourselves with others honestly enough to obtain from the comparison anything worthy of the name of self-knowledge. It is true

that from childhood we have measured our powers—our physical powers at first—against the powers of rivals or possible rivals, and that, in this way, we have got a certain amount of self-knowledge. You knew, for example, that you could jump farther than Tom Smith or John Brown, and that you could produce a better Greek composition than anyone in your class; and you also knew, perhaps, that that ass Robinson could always beat you in mathematics. This was self-knowledge, but of a very limited and superficial kind, having no nearer relation to the self-knowledge of a philosopher than an antiquary's knowledge has to a sociologist's or a philosophical historian's. Self-knowledge worthy of a philosopher would be the outcome of a comparison of all one's powers, taken separately and collectively, with those of others. We cannot, however, all be philosophers and, as Coleridge remarked, it is not necessary that we should. The men of action, who are always likely to be the most numerous class, find out by practice what they themselves can do, and what those with whom (or against whom) they work can do; and that is enough for them; they do not need to know what humanity can do and why humanity does it. Their need is that of the Scotchman who prayed for a good conceit of himself. They need self-confidence rather than self-knowledge.

The Scotchman prayed for a good thing. Self-confidence, of which the excess is bumptiousness and the defect what Aristotle called *micropsychia,* that is, meanness of spirit, is an essential in the make-up of successful people, even of philosophers. Herbert Spencer must have had no small share of it to undertake the exposition of the synthetic philosophy, and to complete it to his liking. Lacking it, he would have written an essay. The implications of his doctrine would of course have been discoverable, but some of them might have remained undiscovered to this day. What confidence in his powers Carlyle must have had when he began *Frederick*! He must have known from his own experience that work begun on the scale of his first volume was bound to be gigantic, as Gibbon, even without such experience, must have known when he was planning his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* Lack of self-confidence reduces thousands to mute inglorious Gibbons, if not to inglorious Miltons (who are rarer)—unhappy beings who have brains but not the focused powers which go with courage. These are the people whose souls are vexed when they see intellectual mediocrities in high places, and who fail to justify the ways of Heaven when they find themselves passed over. They forget the fact that, though the business of the world is done by people of average brain power, the higher positions need men of more than average courage, of more than average self-confidence.

There seems to be no necessary or regular connexion between self-confidence and self-knowledge—such self-knowledge as would have been recognized by a Greek. Some of the shallowest and least introspective of men have more than enough self-confidence, and there are others who have studied their interiors all their days without gaining courage enough to shoulder any but the pettiest responsibilities. Their lack of self-confidence is a serious defect; they are compelled to lie low and see climbers reach the summits with little more self-knowledge than that acquired by climbing.

It may be that the successful extraverts have more self-knowledge than others give them credit for. Most of them are married folk, and while they have been trying through study of their partners to understand the opposite sex, so like and so unlike their own, they have been learning facts about themselves of which celibates are likely to remain for ever ignorant. It is true that some of the greatest philosophers have been unmarried—Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibniz, Hume, Kant, Schopenhauer, and others—but it is also true, I think, that these philosophers were concerned more with the study of man than of men. I should not be surprised to learn that as judges of themselves and of others they showed no more sagacity than ordinary people. One of them, we know, did little for his reputation when he essayed to describe woman, whom he, of all these celibates, was perhaps least qualified to judge fairly. How did Schopenhauer regard himself? Not unfavourably, I dare say, individuals being as well insulated as communities; as well protected from depression resulting from unfavourable comparisons as our ancestors were from the results of comparison with the ancient Greeks and Romans.

The indefatigable Mr. G. D. H. Cole has written yet another book upon post-war problems, and, like its predecessors, it deserves careful study. *The Means to Full Employment* (Gollancz, 6s.) is not an argument for Socialism; "it is about the steps which are necessary for maintaining 'full employment' in a predominantly capitalist society—if it is possible to maintain it in such a society", and it describes the minimum changes necessary to bring this about. Mr. Cole is, of course, not unmindful that a country's economic policy is largely dependent on that of other countries, and to the consideration of such questions as the trade cycle, public works, monetary policy, and "consumers' credits" he adds a study of the international aspects of the problem. All roads lead to Rome, and most of those in Mr. Cole's discussion lead to the Bank of England and its anomalous position.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

CLOSER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONGREGATIONALISTS IN BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

As American representative in Britain of the Congregational Christian Service Committee, it has been my privilege to receive a wonderful welcome on my travels through the British Isles. Overwhelming appreciation is everywhere expressed of the opportunity, through a personal link, to convey thanks for the help sent by the American Congregationalists at the time of the Battle of Britain and since. A similar warmth of feeling was noticeable in the States, dating from the anxious days of 1940, which broke down surface barriers and set free emotions rooted in our common past and tradition. The sending over of a representative arose from the wish for greater knowledge and understanding of the changes effected in the lives of British Congregationalists by the grim experiences through which they were passing.

It seems most desirable that this warmth of feeling should be guided to work for a closer relationship and strengthen our bonds and evolve some plan for closer co-operation in the future—in fact, to make International Congregationalism a real and living force in the world.

Practical suggestions to this end are at present somewhat nebulous; but a beginning has been made in two directions:

1. The exchange of letters between Mrs. Doris Feeney, Secretary of the Federation of Congregational Women, and Mrs. E. E. McClintock, Secretary of Women's Work of the Congregational Christian Churches of America, with the intention of increasing and distributing knowledge of women's work in the two countries and of future co-operation.

2. The establishing of "Pen Friendships". This scheme was started quite modestly by encouraging a few Sunday School scholars here to write letters which were suitably placed in America by the Service Committee. However, so much enthusiasm was created that we now have a register containing many hundred names of young people in the States who desire British "Pen Friends". Several Young People's Fellowships, and other organizations of a similar nature, are corresponding as a group. There have even been cases of adults who wish to be put into touch with corre-

spondents of similar professions or other interests. The matching has been done wherever possible between towns of like names or through some similar natural link. This project has developed to such proportions that the Youth Department of the Union of England and Wales has thought it worth while to set up a Committee to deal with it.

A third suggestion which is just beginning to bear fruit is that, since personal contacts are the soundest method of engendering a better understanding, there should, as soon as circumstances permit, be a more frequent exchange of ministers and that these should be drawn from the younger, less well-known men than has been the case heretofore, who would be able to be away from home for a longer period and would be content to remain in one locality, thus providing the opportunity for closer personal acquaintance. Ideally the ministers' wives should be included in this scheme, so that the women, as well as the men, may come to know one another better. Such exchanges are, on the whole, impracticable on any sizeable scale at present; but the recent invitation to the Rev. Leslie Cooke, from the Congregational-Christian Church of America, to make a three months' visit this spring, culminating with an address at the annual meeting of the Council, is the first move towards effecting the purpose behind the exchanges proposed.

It is interesting that the Rev. Cecil Northcott has just gone to the States on a brief visit and that Drs. Peel and Whale expect to leave this spring to fulfil engagements of long standing—hence Congregationalism will be well represented amongst distinguished visitors from Britain this year.

Other suggestions are: there should be a regular exchange of delegates to Annual meetings; theological students and professors should exchange more readily than is at present the case; the idea worked out by the Colonial Missionary Society by means of "Hands Across the Sea" might be adopted as between the States and Britain also.

A further proposal, already put into practice to some extent, is the exchange of literature. The churches now in contact through the "Pen Friendships" are doing this, as are also the Women's and Youth Departments.

Much of the foregoing may seem over-ambitious at the present time. The question of ways and means will raise its miserable head before much more progress can be made; but the wish for closer contact has been strongly aroused and this is the crucial moment to utilize it by planning towards making practical the ideals desired. Perhaps a Committee should be set up here to consider practical details in co-operation with the American Congregational Service Committee.

Criticism and further suggestions will be welcomed. They should be sent to Mrs. Frieda J. Demarest, M.A., 22 Memorial Hall, E.C.4.

F. J. D.

A YOUTH LEADER'S ADDRESS ON YOUTH SUNDAY.

I WANT to make it clear from the start that this is not going to be a sermon. In the first place what I'm going to say hasn't got a text, and, as you know, in the best circles—no text, no sermon. But, in any case, I feel that this is not the time to preach. I'm not at all sure myself that I am the right person to be speaking to you; this is Youth Sunday, and I feel that one of the younger young people should be giving an address. I think it's mainly a matter of "pulpit-shyness" with them; quite a common

remark was, "Please, I'll do anything else, but don't ask me to do the sermon". Anyway, they asked me to do the evening address, and as I say, it will not be a sermon. I'm very glad of this opportunity to speak to you as Youth Leader, however, and I'm really speaking in that capacity tonight, on behalf of the young folk of this church.

We are very fortunate here in that the officers of the church are enlightened enough to give the young folk a more or less free rein, and we are able to have these Youth Sundays every six months or so. In many churches "Youth Sunday" merely means that the minister or preacher gives a special address designed mainly to appeal to youth, and perhaps even intended to buck their ideas up a bit, and the young folk themselves are highly privileged if they are allowed to read the Lesson. What a contrast with what happens here! The Secretary comes along to me, as Youth Leader, and tells me that the 21st November has been set aside as Youth Sunday; I say, "Oh, good; thank you very much"; and I know, without being told, what the Secretary expects me to do. I know that the young people are to be entirely responsible for the Services on that day. They are expected to provide their own preacher, lead the prayers, read the Lessons, choose the hymns, provide their own organist, choir, and soloists, and to take on the stewarding. At the next meeting of the Fellowship of Youth a Committee is appointed to take on all this work, and make all the arrangements. They draw up the Orders of Service, choose the hymns and readings, and invite various members of the Fellowship to preach, offer the prayers, read the Lesson, play the organ, and in fact do everything that is necessary in the services. Of course, this Committee is not always successful; I remember after the morning service in July someone told me that all the second half of the service was spoilt for him because he was waiting and expecting the collection to be taken any minute; we'd hit on what we thought was the bright idea of taking the collection after the last hymn. However, we soon find out our mistakes, and they can usually be put right next time. One thing we have not been able to manage without—a Choir. We tried it on the first Youth Sunday we held, and the hymn-singing suffered terribly. We are quite unable to provide our own Choir; I don't know why it is, but with very few exceptions, we young folk have the most extraordinary assortment of singing-voices imaginable, and it would be sheer madness to invite us to stand up and lead the singing! It's a great joy, however, to have been able to avail ourselves of the Junior Choir today. They have set us a wonderful example in this respect. We're delighted that they have been able to play such a grand part in our services. I shouldn't be surprised if, in six or seven years' time, the Fellowship of Youth is able to provide half, or even more than half, Mr. ——'s big Choir, because you, Junior Choir, are growing up very quickly; some of you amaze me, the way you've grown in the last two or three years, and it won't be very long now before you'll be members of the Fellowship. That's one of the things the Fellowship is trying to do, you know; provide something for you children to come to when you begin to feel really grown-up. We're waiting for you to come along in a few years' time, and take over from us. Eventually, then, our services take shape. There is a very joyful spirit about the preparations; and when the actual day arrives there is no doubt that all those taking part feel a great sense of responsibility, and a desire to see that their individual part of the service goes as smoothly as possible; and usually it does, although the organist has been known to miss a verse of a hymn now and then; I should add that I am usually the organist!

What is the object of these Youth Sundays? I don't think anyone would seriously suggest that they are intended to give the usual officers and workers a rest; nor is there any spirit of "let youth have its fling" about them. I feel that the church looks on them as an important contribution to its life; the members and officers realize that new life can be brought to the church through its young folk. But the young folk can only be of real help to the church when they come to realize fully what the church stands for; when they feel that they are ready to become members of the church, and to take their part in the responsibilities of running it; and also, when they realize that they are the people who, in fifteen or twenty years' time, will be the officers of the church; responsible for it, and for what it has to offer to the district, for what it has to offer to their children.

What does the church stand for? Well, of course, it stands for the Gospel of Jesus Christ; first and foremost it stands for that; it stands for all that is good and true and right in the world; it stands for God's love for us, and our love to God. It stands also as a challenge to what we call "the world", by which we usually mean the people who don't come to church. But they regard it merely as a building; it means nothing of value to them; it can only mean something to them according to how we run it, according to how we run our own lives. Why do we come to church? The old question. Naturally everyone has his or her own particular reasons for coming in the first place; my particular reason for coming here, eight years ago, was that I was looking out for an organ to practise on. Well, in those days this church hadn't got an organ—at least not the sort I was after; but, I kept on coming. I kept on coming because I liked the minister, and I liked the people I met. I waited about four years before this organ was installed, and I can truthfully say that the practice I have enjoyed on it since has been all the sweeter for the waiting, and for the knowledge that I had some slight hand, along with all the other worshippers, in getting the organ here. But the point is this; that even if we had not had this lovely organ, I should still be coming to this church—and blow organ practice! My life was changed by the effect you people had on me when I came on a casual visit. You attracted me, and my parents with me. But speaking generally, it seems to me that as we progress through our lives we come to church for different reasons; we come to Sunday School because we are asked to—or even ordered to; and a lot of us come to Sunday School for a lark. Then we come to Youth Fellowship, partly for a lark, partly because our friends are there, and partly because we believe in Jesus Christ. Then, as we get into our prime, we come solely because we believe in Christ and want to spread His gospel, and do our utmost for the Kingdom of God. This period is a very elastic one: it can start as early as 17 and go on till we die, or it may start much later in life, and cease long before we die. And there are those who have got past this period—there may be some here tonight—I don't know—who feel that their period of active usefulness is past, that they are no longer able to take part in the social activities of the church; and they come to find comfort and solace in their faith, and to help the church with their prayers. And it seems to me that Youth Sunday is the time when the people of all these periods are most closely united. The children are interested to see those a little older than themselves doing unusual jobs; they can look up to them for a lead; that's a great responsibility for us young folk, isn't it? The young people themselves, while being able to express their own thoughts and ideas, come to realize how much they depend on the experience of their elders. The middle-aged folk rejoice to see their sons and daughters taking on the tasks of the church, and it helps

them to realize that their children are growing up—perhaps have grown up without them noticing. And the older folk can see what sort of young people they are leaving behind them to carry on the work of God in their beloved church. And I say with all sincerity that those of you who have come here today for comfort, those of you who have come in a spirit of hope for the future, can find it here in the young folk of this church. What are we doing? We are learning. In this church you have given us a great heritage; you have shown us what the love of Jesus Christ, and love to God, can do. You have set an example which will take a lot of following. You have succeeded in showing the world what Christ is like; I know that, because, although I didn't realize it for some time afterwards, I caught a glimpse of Him when I first came here. Are we taking up the heritage which you have offered us? I venture to suggest that we are.

I must inevitably in an address of this nature speak of Keith. Keith is not here tonight. He was a member of the Sunday School until about three years ago; he is not yet 18; he has been a member of the Fellowship for about two years. Keith is not here tonight because he has answered God's call in the most wonderful way open to any man. He is in College in training with the intention of becoming a missionary. He has gone away in response to God's call, away from his family and away from his friends—not just for a time, people, but for *life*. You will all be interested to hear that I spent last week-end with him at the College; as some of you may know, he has already started going out each Sunday preaching at little churches. I rather thought, and some of you may have thought the same, that this was merely part of his training and that it was in a way a privilege for him to do this. But I went with him to two of these churches on Sunday last, and I was impressed most strongly by the startling fact that these churches are absolutely relying on people like Keith for their services. The 14 theological students at his College all go out preaching every Sunday; Keith himself has visited six different churches in the few weeks he has been away. The College supplies many churches, far more than there are students. So that you see Keith is already doing essential work for Christ; and I cannot stress too much how vividly I was impressed by the situation as I saw it; there cannot be too many people ready and willing to go about preaching the Gospel. I know that my other young friends will agree with me when I suggest that Keith is the most significant example of what the young people of this church are doing. We don't all get the call to go away and be missionaries; but I do know that we are all called to do some work for Christ; Keith has answered his call; others are answering theirs.

This has not been a sermon: as I said before, it's not my place today to preach; instead, I bring you a humble acknowledgment of the debts the young people owe their elders, and a promise for the future. On behalf of the young people, I promise that we will follow our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, as you have done in the past; I promise that this church will go forward to further triumphs—triumphs as great as those which it has seen in the past.

DISCUSSION

NIEBUHR ON MAN.

SINCE the terms under which the Gifford lectureship is administered were strained to the utmost to permit of the appointment of Karl Barth, no other holder of the office has been so frankly "theological" in his approach as Reinhold Niebuhr. His two volumes, with their masterly presentation of so much material from a single point of view and their reassertion of neglected elements in the Christian tradition against the background of the present day, will long retain their influence. To praise such a work and to criticize it seem equally presumptuous; yet there is that in the point of view from which Niebuhr writes which invites us to criticize. Does he not tell us repeatedly that all our human presentations of the Gospel contain some element of distortion, that all are relative to some particular historical situation and in part vitiated by man's stubborn desire to make the truth of God serve his own interests? We are therefore justified in singling out three points at which this system, brilliant and imposing as it is, is yet gravely defective.

In the first place, in spite of his insistence on "classical Christianity" and "Biblical religion", Niebuhr is in fact highly selective in his employment of the material at his disposal. An analysis of the "Index of Scriptural Passages" at the end of each volume will put this beyond doubt. In the *O.T.* *Daniel* is not once cited: is that because of its hope of a kingdom of God on earth? From the Apocalyptic literature *2 Enoch* and *4 Ezra* are used, but the books are passed over in which the Messianic Hope is of a more political and this-worldly character. In the *N.T.* there are 44 references to *Romans*, 3 to *Hebrews*, and 6 to the Fourth Gospel. It is fairly clear what has happened: the Pauline theology has been taken as the criterion, and what does not square with this has been passed over. The question whether what is thus arrived at can fairly be represented as "Biblical" remains to be answered. Christianity is not for Niebuhr something so rich that it can only be expressed in a number of different types; the single type which is represented by Paul, Augustine, and Luther is the only true one, and by it all others must be judged.

This, of course, leads to a one-sided presentation of the whole case. Among the prophets, for example, Niebuhr regards *Amos* as normative; his message of sheer denunciation is the high-water mark of prophecy, and what follows is of much less worth. But it is difficult to accept as adequate an account of prophecy which would dismiss Hosea's experience of the yearning love of God for His people and Isaiah's hope of the remnant as less inspired than the fierce wrath of Amos. So in the *N.T.*, apart from one or two casual references to the *logos* and to the "Hellenism" of the Fourth Gospel, one of the most important sources is simply not taken into consideration. One would have thought that any statement of the Christian view of human nature which claimed to have the support of the Bible would have devoted at least a chapter to the Johannine Prologue. *1 John* is cited in the last chapter of the second volume for its references to Antichrist, but one would have thought that in an argument in which so much time is spent in the attack on "perfectionism", something more than a footnote would have been assigned to the book which declares so confidently that "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God".

When we pass from the Bible to the history of Christian thought, we find the same principle of selection at work: "classical Christianity" is what is in the line Paul-Augustine-Luther, regardless of the fact that the majority of those who profess and call themselves Christians would stigmatize this—or at least the interpretation of it here put forward—as heresy. To be sure, Niebuhr is prepared to abandon any one or all of these three should need arise; Augustine did not rightly understand the meaning of "grace", Luther was too ready to make terms with authority in the State, and even Paul erred in the same direction in *Rom.* 13. Still, these criticisms are trivial in comparison with the magisterial fashion in which the whole Alexandrian tradition is dismissed, and the Greek Orthodox Church is banned as "perfectionist". It is curious that the optimistic view of human nature should be most strongly represented today among the theologians of the Russian Church in exile, with their experience of war, defeat, revolution, and religious persecution. That fact alone should dispose for ever of the gibe that only the comfortable middle-classes of Britain and America think of man in this way. The section which deals with the mystics and Quakers includes a number of carefully-chosen quotations which do not in fact suffice to fasten upon them the heresy which "regards spirit as the divine quality in man". Behind this failure to do justice to the Platonic tradition in Christian thinking lies an inability to understand Plato's view of human nature: the section in the first volume on "The Classical View of Man" is quite inadequate in this respect.

In the second place, while Niebuhr's type of Christianity is strictly Pauline, it may be doubted whether even Paul is allowed to come into his own. A Lutheran theologian has pointed out that so great is the spell which the Reformer has cast over his followers that even when they are reading Paul they tend to interpret him by Luther. In so doing, of course, they reduce him to something much below his native stature. Whereas for Luther the Gospel was first and last the mercy of God in the forgiveness of sin, for Paul it was rather the mighty power of God at work in the heart and life of the Christian. This, to be sure, is the very question which Niebuhr discusses: What is grace? Is it pardon or power? He arrives at the conclusion that in the *N.T.* it is both, and that we must hold the balance level as between these two conceptions; but before he has gone much farther along the road, he has come down quite definitely on the side of grace as pardon.

In this he is faithful to the Lutheran tradition, but at the cost of being unfaithful to the *N.T.* One would have thought that no one could have read the *N.T.* and failed to see how on well-nigh every page it speaks of the new, victorious life in Christ, of the power of the Holy Spirit, the faith which conquers the world, and the new man who replaces the old. "Not renunciation, or the atoning sacrifice, but victory—triumph over sin and death—is the authentic keynote of the whole New Testament". The modern Lutheran theologian to whom I referred above uses much stronger language than that: "Within the range of his reality Paul knows of no difficulty which cannot be overcome, no commandment which cannot be fulfilled, no opposition he cannot withstand, no task beyond his power to perform, no deed outside the realm of possibility, no intolerable suffering, no unconsolable grief, no crushing care". Is this "perfectionism"? At any rate, it is a striking contrast to the cautious warning against the heresy of thinking that "grace can remove the final contradiction between man and God".

The exegesis of Paul by which the argument of these two volumes is constantly supported again shows signs of just such a principle of selection

as was employed from the outset: what in Paul does not square with the presuppositions of the writer is passed over. It is in Niebuhr's favour that he admits at one point that this is so: he tells us that the choice between two possible interpretations of *Rom.* 7 will be determined by "our previous doctrinal presuppositions". The present objection, however, is not so much to presuppositions as to omissions which entirely alter the nature of the argument.

Two instances of this will suffice, since both are of major importance. In this very passage, in which the Apostle describes so vividly the conflict within the self, Niebuhr stops at the words: "The good which I would I do not"; but Paul does not, he goes on to the triumphal cry of thanksgiving to the Lord who has delivered him out of this condition. So in the passage in the previous chapter in which Adam and Christ are contrasted, the point which Paul is making is not that mankind is lost in Adam—which is Niebuhr's interest in the passage—but that all this has now been triumphantly overcome by the salvation Christ has brought into the world. Niebuhr follows Paul while he describes the dark background to human life but forsakes him as soon as he goes on to speak of the glory by which it is now illuminated.

In the third place, the account of sin in these volumes is very much open to question. Sin is something which arises directly between man and God; it is titanic pride, man's effort to make himself instead of God the centre of his existence, his will to usurp the place of the Creator. That there is something of this in the Bible cannot be doubted, but there is much of a very different nature. The emphasis seems rather to shift from sin as an infringement of the divine prerogative to sin as want of love towards one's brother man. The second way of regarding sin is surely more in accordance with the Christian view of God.

It is quite true that the old myths of many peoples speak of men who would assault and dethrone the gods, and we recall the use which Ibsen has made of the same motif in his play *The Master Builder*. But there is something in all this which is so flattering to man's pride that it may well be suspect. No doubt man from the very beginning liked to think of himself in grandiose terms, to dramatize himself, as the psychologist would say, as one of whom even the gods had good reason to be afraid. But perhaps our sins are much more commonplace in their origin than that; as often as not they are the result of indolence or the love of ease; we want to be spared the pain of a new idea or we are so obsessed with the moment that we lose sight of the eternal issues. The crucifixion of Christ was not the work of men who wanted to transcend the limits of their finitude, but of men who were concerned about their revenues, their jobs, and their social prestige. And what of sins of omission? These are quite neglected in Niebuhr's account, but they are surely as destructive as any sins of commission.

These considerations are more than theoretical—they have a practical bearing. When the prophets denounce the sins of the time, they lay most stress on injustice against the stranger and the poor; the *N.T.* catalogues of vices are concerned mainly with the wrong of man to his brother-man. We sin against God, not so much by any heroic, if futile, gesture of defiance, but by dishonouring the men and women whom He has created in His image. Here is an appeal to which the conscience of our time can be expected to respond; even those who will never see that they are in direct opposition to God may come to understand that they are doing despite to the Father by the suffering they bring upon His children.

E. L. Allen.

V

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA.

THERE is a well-known passage in Macaulay in which he contrasts the folly of the Anglican Church in losing Wesley with the astuteness of the Roman Church in keeping Loyola. The Church of England, nevertheless, has always been proud of its comprehensiveness—and not without reason—though some of its members deplore the fact that others are allowed to remain within it: we have heard Anglo-Catholics use language about the Bishop of Birmingham as violent as we have heard Americans use about—oh, no, not Hitler or Tojo, but their own President. Mrs. Roosevelt is credited with a story about jungle warfare. In order to make Japanese snipers show themselves American soldiers shouted rude and abusive remarks about the Emperor. Finally a Japanese emerged and prefixed all the impolite and obscene words he knew to the name of the President, and then returned to shelter without a shot being fired. Asked why he didn't shoot, the American who had him covered replied, "Well, I couldn't shoot a fellow Republican, could I?"

Many thoughts about the comprehensiveness of the Church of England have arisen whilst reading three recent books—Dr. Coulton's autobiography, *The Letters of Evelyn Underhill* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.), and Vol. II of Bishop Hensley Henson's *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life* (Oxford Press, 21s.), and they have been reinforced by the way in which that Church accepts from other denominations ministers in search of the peace, opportunity, success, security—or whatever it might be—they have hitherto failed to obtain, even when a man like "Nicodemus" is declined.

Of Dr. Coulton's book we say little here, save to point out that the Church failed to hold him—he found that his intellectual honesty would not allow him to take priests' Orders—while it succeeded in holding the other two, critical of it as they often were.

To Evelyn Underhill I gladly confess myself in considerable debt. I remember how salutary I found *The Golden Sequence,* which made me realize the poverty of my own spiritual life and acquainted me with the fact that there were realms of spiritual experience of which I knew nothing at all. So conscious am I of my debt that I am almost sorry to have read Mr. Charles Williams's Introduction to these letters: I wish I didn't know Evelyn Underhill was so well off, able to visit Europe every spring from 1898 to 1913, and always with her lines in pleasant places. That at one period she spent two afternoons a week visiting in the slums only throws into relief the air of comfort which pervades her life. It is hard for those who have never experienced insecurity to understand the lives millions of people live, though Mr. Williams writes:

> She was humbly and acutely aware of those unknown and harassed Marthas at the expense of whose pain we all live.

It is significant that with the outbreak of the war and direct contact with life in the raw, the letters show more understanding of ordinary men and things, and give a greater sense of reality.

Evelyn Underhill was born in 1875 and died in 1941. She wrote three novels, and married in 1907 at a moment when she was all but convinced that Roman Catholicism was true and all but ready to make her submission.

Pius X's encyclical against Modernism helped to block the way, and for years she was uncertain: "she dissented and was inflexibly called; she assented and was inflexibly refused". For long she was unable to accept Anglicanism, writing in 1911:

> I cannot accept Anglicanism instead; it seems an entirely different thing. So here I am, going to Mass and so on, but entirely deprived of the sacraments.

Ten years later she became a practising member of the Church of England, and to that Church and to *the* Church rendered conspicuous service by her books on mysticism. Here are words about the Church (1932) which should bring heart and hope to many a discouraged Christian:

> As to feeling rather dismayed by the appearance of the Church Visible at the moment—that is inevitable I'm afraid to some extent. But keep your inner eye on the Church Invisible—what the Baron used to call "the great centralities of religion". That is what really takes one up into itself "with angels and archangels and all the company of Heaven", not only the Vicar and the curate and the Mothers' Union Committee. But there is something entrancing, don't you think, in a supernatural society, so wide and generous and really Catholic, that it can mop up all these—even the most depressing—and still remain the Bride of Christ? The Church is an "essential service" like the Post Office, but there will always be some narrow, irritating and inadequate officials behind the counter and you will always be tempted to exasperation by them.

The greatest influence in her life was that of Baron von Hügel. She put herself under his direction, and became his

> friend (or rather, disciple and adorer). He is the most wonderful personality I have ever known—so saintly, so truthful, sane and tolerant. . . . Somehow by his prayers or something he *compelled* me to experience Christ. He never said anything more about it [he had told her she "wasn't much better than a Unitarian"]—but I know humanly speaking he did it. It took about four months—it was like watching the sun rise very slowly—and then suddenly one knew what it was.

Here are some gems from von Hügel quoted in her letters:

> The essence of religion is not development from below, but a golden shower from above.
>
> It is so much more He who must hold us, than we who must hold Him.
>
> Christianity does not explain suffering but does show us what to do with it.

With all her reverence for her director, her personality was never overwhelmed, nor was her sense of humour:

> The Baron dosed me with Fénelon at one time, till I told him that a Perfect Gentleman giving good advice to Perfect Ladies was no good to me—since when his name has not been mentioned between us!

Another example is her quotation of Wilberforce's words [is this William or Samuel?]: "Yes, indeed, my dear Duchess, as your Grace so truly observes, God is love".

She herself became a spiritual director. No calling in the world is more difficult and dangerous, as these letters abundantly prove; but Miss Underhill was saved by her common sense: "don't fuss", she says time and time again; "don't always be examining the roots; remember you can't be on

the heights of spiritual exaltation all the time; and remember that the New Testament is the best of all books of meditation".

One could quote from the letters almost *ad libitum*. Sometimes Miss Underhill talks about the Sacraments in a way I find foreign and distressing, as when she makes the post-resurrection life of Jesus "directly continuous with His Presence in the Blessed Sacrament"; but that is no reason why I should doubt all they meant to her any more than I doubt the reality of the religion of the Quaker who observes no sacraments. There are no doubt souls who find this counsel sound:

> by this balanced *régime* of sacramental acts, mental prayer, and love and service of others, you will nourish and deepen your spiritual life better than in any other way,

who see in sacramentalism

> the humble acceptance of grace through the medium of things—God coming into our soul by means of humblest accidents—the intermingling of spirit and sense.

Others find their sacraments in the love and service of men. Only when the Church makes room for both will she be truly the Church of Christ.

In the Church of England Miss Underhill, after much hesitation, found a home. To the service of that Church Bishop Hensley Henson gave his life—and not an "unimportant life", for the title but reflects the inverted inferiority complex so often evident in one of the most readable autobiographies of our time. The Bishop confesses that it would have given the "old Adam" pleasure to refuse a Primacy, yet he preferred independence to dignity and would have found "the work odious and the dignity stifling".

As in the first volume, much reliance is placed on the private journal which Bishop Henson has kept since 1885—a journal which I hope to live to read, though many dignitaries of the Anglican Church must shudder at the thought that it will ever see the light of day. In it Dr. Henson writes with the utmost frankness about men and things, and shows that the Church of England, if it is comprehensive, is not always the happiest of families. As indications of Dr. Henson's letting himself go, one or two sentences relating to the Lambeth Conference in 1930 may be quoted:

> If our problems could be solved by well-arranged pageants, we should do well enough even now!
>
> The Bishop of Oxford (Strong) had something useful to say, and said it in his worst manner. The Bishop of Goulburn was fluent and copious, evidently giving the substance of his commentary on the Colossians, which, he told the Conference, had engaged his leisure for years past.

This volume begins with the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and describes the threatened disruption of the Church on first principles, with the then Archbishop of Canterbury, declaring, "I would not be the Archbishop in whose time the High Church party was driven out of the Church of England", and other Bishops threatening resignation. Meanwhile Dr. Henson was drafting notes such as this, where, as always, cogency of thought is matched by lucidity of language:

> No ideal of unity can satisfy us which fails in range or in quality, *i.e.*, which leaves outside the visible church any genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, or which sets before the world a partial or distorted conception of Christian fellowship. Whether the attainment of that ideal would imply the organization of the visible church as a single

polity is a point which neither the New Testament nor the experience of the Christian Society enables us to determine.

The Journal describes Dean Inge's opinion of the Conference's resolutions, and states the Bishop's summing up:

> He thought them disappointing, and on some points reactionary, but agreed they must be made the most of. I was interested to observe the generally unfavourable view which he took of our performance, for which the members of the Conference are for ever thanking God, as if it were a marvel! Perhaps the ardour of the gratitude discloses the measure of the fear! . . . The bishops themselves impressed me as a body of men intensely earnest, not (with few exceptions) either learned or men of marked intellectual powers, but devoted to their work. They represented an immense variety of experience, endeavour, and circumstance. It is no exaggeration to say that the Conference had something of the range and largeness of spirit of a truly Catholic assembly. Some of the missionary bishops are ecclesiastical statesmen of no mean quality. Several men struck me as genuinely apostles, *e.g.*, Brent, now Bishop of Western New York. The prevailing spirit of the Conference was neo-Tractarian, though there were a good many bishops who would call themselves Evangelical. Mainly the latter were the senior bishops. The younger and abler men have "no use for" either Protestantism or Anglicanism. There is a real desire for union with non-episcopalians, but no adequate perception of the difficulty. Episcopacy is exalted far beyond what either its history or its actual influence justifies. It is not perceived that this lofty claim for Episcopacy cannot, and in fact does not, stand alone. The type of Christianity, of which the fact and doctrine of exclusive episcopacy forms an integral factor, is not really possible for modernly educated Christians. The choice for them lies between Rome and some form of Protestantism, *i.e.*, between authority and private judgment.

I take advantage of the article on Disestablishment Dr. Henson contributes to our pages to pass by references to the subject, though mention must be made of the discussion of Matthew Arnold's association of the Establishment and genuine intellectual distinction. After pointing out that if men are denied admission to the Universities they are likely to become uncultured and narrow, the Bishop goes on:

> If it be true, as I think it is, that the sectarian habit and atmosphere are unfavourable to largeness of sympathy and tolerance of temper, it must be remembered that Dissent stimulates individuality and to that extent favours the development of ability. Moreover, the triumph of sectarianism, or, as it is now called, Anglo-Catholicism, within the Church of England, has, undoubtedly, driven a wedge between the Church and the Nation. The clergy are now largely severed from the main stream of English life.

The picture of the Church of England given through the book is indeed that of a comprehensive Church, but also that of a Church so divided against itself that it can make no effective witness for the truth:

> S. Mary Abbot's, which is a large church, was filled at 11.30 a.m. There was a moderate ritual. The parson explained to me that he was not himself an Anglo-Catholic but "a humble follower of the Tractarians". My sermon was listened to very closely, and perhaps caused some consternation! The truth is that, though these Anglo-Catholics talk bravely about *Disestablishment*, there is really nothing that they dread more, for they know that the comfortable anarchy of

the paralysed Establishment gives them a measure of licence which no disestablished Church would tolerate for a day!

Bishop Henson has been accused of pessimism for such expressions of opinion as (1928), "Since Cranmer's accession was there ever a darker outlook for the Church of England?" It is not so much in his analysis of the situation within Anglicanism, however, as in his diagnosis of the position of the whole Church that these pages are most pertinent. A man is no friend of the Church and no faithful minister of Christ who either refuses to see things as they are or to acknowledge them: one of the most disquieting features about the Church between the Wars has been the refusal of so many within it to listen to the faithful friend or the prophetic voice. Here Dr. Henson puts his finger on the spot with unerring skill:

> The inadequacy of the practical effect of Christianity in view of the orthodox theory as to its origin and character has always seemed to me the most formidable difficulty in the way of discipleship. It could not have been so at first, for the Pauline epistles are a demonstration of the extraordinary altitude, spiritual, moral, and intellectual, to which the first converts were raised by their new religion. The scandals of the apostolic churches, which the epistles frankly disclose, only throw into greater prominence the normally high standards actually accepted.
>
> Eloquent pictures of idealized national life, in which the Parish Church, wherein a cultured saint leads a worshipping community in the way of spiritual duty, forms the central feature, will no longer arrest attention and move enthusiasm. We have got beyond all that. We know too well that such pictures have no sufficient correspondence with the facts, as the facts force themselves on our notice, to be anywise serviceable. Even if we are able so far to free ourselves from prejudice and habit as to gather into our conception of the Church in the parish, "All who profess and call themselves Christians", even that Church is but a petty and feeble factor in the general life. We know, moreover, that whatever may be the essential truth of its moral and spiritual unity, the actual experience of this idealized church, *"the Body of Christ, the Pillar and ground of the truth"*, shows it to be so sharply divided on almost all questions which interest civilized mankind, that its effect in moulding the decisions of the State is almost nothing, and its witness to the fundamental principles of faith and duty is without convincing power. By general agreement and (for the considering Christian) humiliating admission, Christianity is placed in the category of private notions which a man may cherish but by which he must not seriously guide his civil behaviour!

This is a brave book—but Dr. Henson has never lacked courage. He has had to face many obstacles and some doughty opponents, but he has won his way to the respect of all. Difficult indeed is the problem—now facing more and more thoughtful Christians—how far it is right to remain within a Church and give one's self to its service whilst believing that the form of the Church must be radically changed if the Church is to do the work to which she is called. So much effort is now devoted to maintaining the Church's outward form, its ancient organization and technique, which, like a body decaying if not gangrenous, is slowly killing it, when the need is for a new body in which the spirit can find an expression adapted to new times.

But that leads to wider problems than *Ecclesia Anglicana* as illustrated by these books. It is not without impish pleasure that we ask Anglican friends who suggest that a creedless Congregationalism must lead to doc-

trinal licence whether there has been more Christological diversity in Congregationalism during this century than in the Church of England. Equally when the dissidence and the fissiparous nature of Dissent are urged against Free Churchmen, there must be kept at hand "doggerel . . . scribbled" by Bishop Henson when the Bishops had expressed their "unanimous concurrence" with a statement read by the Archbishop of Canterbury (1928).

N. and W., B. and E.
Combine in our glorious unity,
White is black, and black is white,
Always providing we unite
The hapless public to deceive
And we our incomes to receive,
For are we not all "C. of E."
Bound in a glorious unity?

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN IMPRESSION

WILFRED MONOD

[*There are some of us who, though not compatriots of Wilfred Monod, the French scholar-saint, were privileged to know him personally and intimately. It was only towards the end of last year that we heard he had died during the summer. Later, there reached London a French periodical containing an appreciation of him by* Pastor Bertrand, *who was one of his colleagues in the ministry of the* Oratoire du Louvre *in Paris, the most historic and important Protestant church in France. The article has been reprinted in the magazine of the Huguenot Church in London; and because it expresses so finely what those of us who knew him feel so deeply, I have asked permission to translate part of it.*—JESSIE FORSYTH ANDREWS.]

IT is not easy to sketch in a few lines the spiritual likeness of the friend who has just passed from us. The great diversity of his gifts, the multiplicity of his activities, and the number of things he was interested in; the striking contrast between his nature, spontaneous, gay, full of humour, and the strict discipline he imposed on himself—all these things combine to discourage even a friend from giving any account of the profound religious impression made by this master of the Inner Life. Yet it is possible to show by a few touches, if not all that he was, at least the reasons why he was worthy of the deep love he called forth.

The fundamental quality of his nature seemed to be a most acute sensitiveness. No suffering left him untouched, there was no joy he did not seek to share. He had the sensitiveness of the poet, which takes apparently insignificant facts and finds in them matter for compassion or sympathy, an element of beauty or grandeur. . . .

To this gift of nature there was added by grace a most rare depth and intensity; so that what might have been mere sentimentality or literary effusiveness became kindness, even love. The extraordinary sweetness of the smile with which he welcomed his visitors, even in the utter weakness of his last days, had a charm which invited them to follow him as Christians on to a plane above earthly things. No self-concern, no bitterness against

any one whatsoever, no thought of scorn or rancour, could live in the shadow of the supernatural peace which radiated from him—indeed it is difficult to use such words in connection with him.

The love of Christ dwelt in him; it was the foundation of his Christian socialism. . . . The pastor who had wrestled with drink and immorality in the slums of Rouen had retained an unforgettable vision of human sin and suffering—a vision which led him to create near his Paris church of the *Oratoire* the pioneer institution called "the Clearing", by which he strove not only to guard people from suffering, but to bring into their lives beauty and poetry as well as courage and faith.

And to this gift of Nature, and this work of grace, his own will had added a third characteristic—the strict discipline which manifested itself in perfect self-control. In his presence you never had the impression that instinct had got ahead of will. I do not think that even in the keenest debate he ever uttered a thoughtless word or an irresponsible phrase. Those who knew him best say that they never heard him raise his voice, nor did they ever come up against any prejudice or irritability in him.

Which is not to say that he never showed brave and generous indignation, or that he always agreed with everyone. Quite the contrary. When he thought, rightly or wrongly, that it was a matter of conscience, he became wholly intractable. It was his habit in speaking to be entirely careless of hurting susceptibilities, but supremely careful never to wound souls. . . .

. . . The ultimate reality . . . at the centre of his being was a faith and consecration which were complete and unreserved. The distinction, and even disharmony, between "the man" and "the pastor" was to him entirely meaningless. He was wholly pastor, and never spoke to anyone otherwise than as a pastor. A taxi-driver, a tradesman, was for him not a stranger, but a brother for whom Christ died, and to whom he must make known the gospel of the Saviour. And this ministry was carried on in a way so far from sanctimonious—on the contrary, so full of poetry, spontaneity, and humour—that all the strangers whose souls he tried to reach welcomed his words with respect and gratitude.

. . . It was from this primacy of the Spirit and the Christian way of life that the chief forms of his activity were derived. He entered the ecumenical movement, and for a time played a prominent part in it, through no love for organization, but so that he might remove from the path of the ordinary man one stumbling-block—the division of the Church of Christ into hostile camps. . . . If he held a rare spiritual prestige throughout French Protestantism and far beyond, it was because men recognized in him—they could do no other—a son of the Spirit, a transparent soul through whom there penetrated to us some rays of the glory of Christ. . . .

. . . Although he had not preached in his own pulpit since 1940, yet through the souls of his colleagues he still gave the best of himself to the services he was too far away to attend. And above and beyond the fascinating writer, theologian, preacher, poet, we loved and sought the man himself, who never ceased to be our *minister*.

That is why, in writing this poor expression of all the love and gratitude we bear him, I have chosen to put no title before his name. I have called him neither pastor nor professor—I have used only the four syllables which before God and man are the symbol of that radiant personality.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

Once we killed bad men: now we liquidate unsocial elements. Virtue has become *integration* and diligence *dynamism,* and boys likely to be worthy of a commission are "potential officer material". Most wonderful of all, the virtues of thrift and temperance, and even of ordinary intelligence, are *sales-resistance.*

C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man.*

For, it should be faced, protest is *not* the principal function of Protestantism; neither is Catholicism invariably its principal enemy. This becomes more obvious with every decade. Protestantism as we know it is a half-way house, between Catholicism and a new world-view as firmly grounded and all-embracing as Catholicism itself once was. The Reformers returned to the springs of Christianity, not in order to stay there drinking, but in order that they should be diverted into a new and cleaner channel and irrigate more thirsty lands. Until the new channel is as wide and deep and many-branching as the old, it will never contain all the water. Until Protestantism has made its own all that is of enduring value in the great Roman repository of theoretical and practical wisdom, the elements of destruction and creation in it are delicately balanced, and there is a perpetual danger of the destructive scale falling, of one untruth replacing another, of Protestantism itself being temporarily deposed by a parricidal paganism. Conversely, until that happens, the Roman Church will always have a share in the truth; it will never be an empty, outgrown shell.

F. Lea, *Carlyle Prophet of To-day.*

The failure to harness colour, form and sound to the service of a worshipful attitude towards the whole of living implies a failure to create an atmosphere within which mysticism can flourish. Similarly, a like deficiency is to be noticed wherever sacramentalism is tied up with certain ecclesiastical ordinances and is not applied to every manifestation of life in nature and in humanity, life unbounded and marked by a natural beauty which belongs to it. The separation of religion and æsthetic appreciation, of sacramentalism and the wholeness of nature, of worship and art is a sign of the extent to which a complaisant secularity has invaded the church, driving out religion and replacing it with a deadened stereotype of worship from which a life-giving spirit has evaporated and within which mysticism has been quenched.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, *Religion To-morrow.*

The question of authority is one of the most urgent with which modern man is faced. It will not be found in any "rule of life" except in so far as it is in accordance with the mind of Christ. It will not be found in the Bible except in so far as the Bible is the record of the Drama of the Incarnation, the preparation for it in the unique religious experience of the Hebrews, the result of it in the creation of the Church. It will not be found in private judgment except in so far as "reason" is man's equipment for the apprehension of the Truth as it is in Jesus. It will not be found in the State except in so far as it is the divine means for the realization in corporate life of that Freedom, Justice and Fellowship which Christ reveals as the divine way of life. It will be found only in the Church as it proclaims Christ incarnate, crucified, risen and ascended, as it teaches the faith once delivered to the Saints, sustains men in it by the ministry of word and sacrament, and manifests in its life the way of Christ's love and compassion. The authority is Christ, the Lord and Saviour. The life of man and society depends on the acceptance of it.

E. D. P. Kelsey, *The Dynamic of Reconstruction.*

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Book of Isaiah. Vol. II (XL-LXVI). By E. J. KISSANE. Brown & Nolan. 21s.

The first volume of this commentary by a well-known Roman Catholic scholar was published three years ago. The lines of treatment (as before) are those of a fairly lengthy critical introduction to the whole and a brief one to the translation of each section, followed by the commentary on this, and a summary statement of emendations made in the Masoretic text. The earlier volume gave the impression that the author was maintaining the unity of authorship of our whole book of *Isaiah*, for he said of his work that "it attempts to defend the traditional view that Isaiah is the author of all the prophecies". But this is considerably modified by what is said in Vol. II about 40-66, *viz.*, "the teaching of Isaiah on the future destiny of Israel is expounded to his fellow-exiles by an unknown prophet at the close of the exile". It is argued that this position does not contradict the decision of the Biblical Commission of the writer's Church, which said that the critical arguments do not *compel* the recognition of more than one author. This somewhat disingenuous position recalls Newman's famous re-interpretation of the reference to "masses" in the Anglican article.

In maintaining the unity of 40-66, the author divides the whole on his strophic theory into ten sections, each concluded with a brief psalm. To get this arrangement, considerable transferences of the text are necessary, and some of the resultant re-interpretations seem very forced. Thus the first section (40-42^{12}) is headed "The Chosen People", and "The Call of Abraham" is made fundamental to it. Yet the only reference to him is "seed of Abraham" in 41^{8}, and this is made the ground for referring to him the career of military conquest outlined in 41^{2ff} (usually and rightly interpreted of Cyrus). Against the dating of 56-66 in the post-exilic period, he asserts that the conditions there described existed only in the pre-exilic period—surely an ultra-optimistic view of the history of Israel. The reference to the temple in 66^{6} has to be referred to a Babylonian palace (against the context) in order to reconcile the passage with a date prior to 520.

Dr. Kissane's view of the "Servant" is that "he is at one time the nation Israel, at another an individual prophet, and at another the Messiah" (the last applying only to 53). He might have made use of the fluid conception of corporate personality, which helps us to see how the individual and group ideas could pass easily from one to the other. He regards the Messianic reference as being made in quite general terms, and as not including the idea of resurrection. It is clear that he derives this "Messianic" view from the context which he gives to the poem rather than from its actual terms.

We can hardly allow his general claim that "The meaning is the same whether the writer [of 40-66] is Isaiah or an unknown prophet of the period of the exile or later". His defence of this unity rests on a strophic scheme

which dominates and profoundly affects the interpretation. He seeks to give (partial) support to the tradition of unity by asking, "Could one conceive the work of a modern Italian poet becoming attached to the *Divina Commedia* in such a way that a couple of centuries hence the whole would be looked upon as the work of Dante?" But this ignores the crucial point that Dante exists in many printed copies, whilst an ancient prophet existed in one, or, at most, in several manuscripts, each of which might be regarded as the property of its owner, who would often thriftily fill up blank spaces.

We do not think, therefore, that the commentary can be safely used by those who are not willing to accept the writer's relative adherence to tradition. This is a pity, for the notes are often suggestive and illuminative. The high scholarly qualities of the work would in themselves commend it, as do its general plan and pointed relevancy of comment.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Five Books of Moses. By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co. $3.00.

This is an acute and painstaking criticism of the dominant view of the Pentateuch held by Biblical criticism. As such it is to be welcomed, whatever may be thought of its methods and conclusions. S. R. Driver's *Introduction* is taken to represent the main position to be attacked. The documentary hypothesis is indicted for its appeal to variations in the use of the divine name and in general diction, to the occurrence of repetitions, to the differences of subject-matter. The resultant critical view of the development of Israel's religion is then described and itself criticized. Finally appeal is made to archæology, especially to the antiquity of written records, as showing the possibility of a Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

The author makes use of the favourite "Fundamentalist" method of emphasizing the differences amongst critics at different periods—a method which would equally discredit astronomy and chemistry. It is a pity, also, that he should descend to the level of accusing the critics of "doctoring the evidence". What are we to say of his own attempt to disprove the plain statement of *Deut.* 18^1: "the priests the Levites, *all the tribe of Levi*"? He leaves the italicized words out of account; they do not square with his theory that not all Levites were priests at this time. Nor, again, is it just to accuse Biblical criticism of being based on opposition to supernaturalism. Surely it is as possible and as legitimate for an evangelical believer to see God's revelation in a series of documentary records as in the work of one man. The author's arguments to establish his own "pre-supposition" are often ingenious, but equally often quite unconvincing, such as the attempt to re-translate *Jer.* 7^{22ff} as though "concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices" meant "for the sake of (getting) them".

The general impression likely to be left on an informed reader is that such guerrilla warfare does not check the main advance of criticism. It is true that single lines of evidence can sometimes be shown to be insufficient. But it is the cumulative effect that counts, and this is like that of the multitude of threads which bound Gulliver. There are undoubtedly many points in our analysis of the documents at which uncertainty must remain, for the documents have passed through many hands, each owner or user having the opportunity to modify them to his always practical purpose. Nevertheless, it is significant that none of the alternative theories so far offered have been able to displace the "documentary hypothesis" as an explanation of the phenomena. We do not think that the present volume,

in spite of its labour and ingenuity, will convert Bible students to a belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, though it may confirm those who already hold such a belief, especially if they do not know how much more has to be said before a justified decision can be reached.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Marcion and the New Testament. By John Knox. Cambridge and Chicago University Presses. 12s.

Like many other students of that obscure but fateful period which led to the formation of a Christian Canon, Dr. Knox takes as a starting-point the collection, by some enlightened leader at Ephesus in the nineties, of ten Pauline Epistles. He agrees with Goodspeed that *Eph.* was written there and then as a prologue to the rest. These, he believes, were arranged in order of length (letters to the same church being treated as one)—*Cor., Rom., Thess., Gal., Col.-Phmn., Phil.* In his *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* he names that leader, whose zeal was to have such momentous results for Marcion—and for us all: it was that same Onesimus, who in youth owed everything—conversion, liberation from slavery, and dedication to a higher service—to St. Paul himself, and in old age, as bishop of Ephesus, won the heart of Ignatius.

If the church at Sinope, of which Marcion's father was bishop, was a Paulinist community possessing copies of this primitive *Corpus Paulinum,* and of our Third Gospel in its original form (but few if any Jewish Scriptures), this would help to explain Marcion's choice of just these books, to the exclusion of all others, for his "Gospel and Apostle", as the only authoritative vehicle (*"instrumentum"*) for the revelation in Christ of a hitherto unknown God. This was in fact, if not in name, the first New Testament, and the Catholic *O.T.* and *N.T.* together was the Church's answer to it, given at Rome (not Ephesus, as Harnack and others thought) *c.* A.D. 150-175—the only possible answer in the circumstances. It contained all the Marcionites had, and more; for their mutilated and anonymous *Luke,* the four-fold Gospel; for their "Apostle", the *Acts* of all the Apostles, thirteen Pauline Epistles, and those of other "Apostles" too, finally *Rev.* Also it retained those ancient Scriptures which they rejected, and restored to the books they did accept the passages they cut out.

So the Catholic *N.T.* was, in a sense, as Harnack put it, "an anti-Marcionite creation on a Marcionite basis". Not that but for Marcion there would have been no *N.T.* Sooner or later the Church must in any case have made some selection, from such specifically Christian writings as had been read with appreciation deepening into reverence, to rank as "Scripture", in the strict sense, side by side with what had been for generations its only "Scriptures". Still the fact remains, and this is our author's main contention, that Marcion's activity was the decisive occasion which forced the Church in self-defence to make the reply it did.

Further, he is convinced that, not only in its general pattern (Gospel and Apostles), but also to some extent in its contents—in some of the books finally chosen for canonization, in at least part of their subject matter, and even in their text as transmitted to us—our *N.T.* bears traces of the conflict in which it took shape. It is in these respects a different *N.T.* from the one we might have received if Marcion had not lived. Perhaps it was not only Marcion who took liberties with the text of both Gospel and Epistles. If he omitted what did not suit his views, may not his opponents have made, as he said they did, additions to suit theirs? Since it is their text which has survived, may not some of these interpolations appear even in our oldest MSS? Dr. Knox believes this to be the case, especially in *Rom.,*

and he thinks it probable that Marcion's text, in so far as this can be reconstructed, is at many points nearer that of the lost autographs than any modern text. He is, however, well aware of the immense difficulties presented by this line of research. Again, from a comparison of data in Tertullian and Epiphanius, he infers that Marcion's "Apostle" preserved the original order of Pauline Epistles in that first Ephesian *Corpus*, except that *Gal.* was promoted to head the list, while *Eph.* misnamed "Laodiceans" came down to fill the vacant place. He accepts the Ephesian imprisonment of Paul, and dates *Col.*, *Phmn.*, and "possibly" *Phil.* during it. As for the Pastoral Epistles, he follows Martin Rist in reviving F. C. Baur's view, that they were intended by their author to present his readers with a Catholic Paul, who denounces beforehand the errors of Marcionism —involving a date not long before A.D. 150. About that same time, he suggests, *Luke-Acts*, as one work in two parts, Gospel and Apostles, was given its present form by an anti-Marcionite editor, who made extensive additions (including the first two chapters and those passages which show some acquaintance with Josephus), to that "Proto-Luke", which Marcion had modified in the opposite direction, and to two other sources, combining accounts of the Jerusalem Apostles and of a Paul who is in much closer harmony with them, and goes further in acknowledging their authority, than the Paul of *Gal.* This editor, Knox argues against Goodspeed and others, was not ignorant of Paul's Epistles, but ignored them, and set himself to correct any impression of disunity derived from them, in the interests of his primary purpose—"to demonstrate the continuity of Christianity with Judaism".

It will be seen that our author is one of those moderns who treat the old Tübingen School with a renewed respect and think we have more to learn from it than most of us, in our reaction from its extreme positions, have realized. P. N. HARRISON.

Jesus Christ the Teacher. By W. A. CURTIS. Oxford Press. 10s. 6d.
The World Christ Knew. By ANTHONY C. DEANE. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 5s.
The Heart and Mind of Jesus. By T. EDMUNDS. Epworth Press. 2s.
Thy Kingdom Come. By BERNARD KELLY. Burns, Oates. 9s.

While there has been through the centuries, and still is, interminable discussion on the Person and the Work of Christ, there has always been unanimous recognition of Him as teacher. It is therefore the more remarkable, as Prof. Curtis says, that only in the latter half of the nineteenth century do we find treatises large or small on the Teaching of Jesus. The reasons for this long neglect are enumerated and explained in *c.* 20. But since Seeley's *Ecce Homo* appeared in 1865 there has been a steady output of such studies, of which the present volume—while in every sense an independent work—may be regarded as the consummation. After a general introduction on "The Saviour of Men a Teacher", the work falls into three main divisions, "The Teacher at Work", "Themes of the Teaching", and "The Teaching and the Church".

An outstanding quality of this book is that it reveals a scholar of the first magnitude speaking in language understanded of the people. Indeed its very simplicity may blind one to the range and depth of its erudition. It has that perfection of style whose very clarity constitutes its distinction. There are long sentences (but not involved), and short; there are felicitous phrases; there are flashes of wit. And there is sound exegesis and interpretation. But *the* outstanding quality is that it is the spiritual precipitate

of one who is now becoming a senior if not an "aged" disciple, the fruitful harvest of one who, for many years a teacher (and a prince of his Church), has never ceased to be a learner in the school of Christ. And he takes us again to that school.

To myself, and I hope to many others, this will become an indispensable book. I would say of it as the writer himself says of *Ecce Homo:* "No better book can be placed in the reader's hands, whether as instruction or as stimulus". It is difficult to single out any one chapter as the best, though attention must be called to those passages (especially *cc.* 18, 20, and 21) in which the writer applies his theme to present-day conditions and problems; and to *c.* 17 on "The Church", notable for its treatment of *Matt.* 16^{18f}, 18^{15-20}. The whole book is based mainly on the Synoptic Gospels, but the Fourth is also taken into account. It is greatly to be hoped that Prof. Curtis will himself undertake a task to which he refers on p. 215, that

> of investigating the precise relation of the leading ideas in this (the Fourth) Gospel, which are so characteristically expounded in its own language, to the germinal sayings and thoughts of the Galilean and Judæan teaching.

This book would be cheap at a considerably higher price. It has perfect indexes, and so far as I have detected only two *corrigenda*. On p. 196 (and in the Index) "Shelma" should be "Shebna", and on p. 92 the "four" months to harvest have ("for the elect's sake"?) become "three". I would also delete the comma after "saints" (p. 199, l. 1.).

Canon Deane has enlarged and rewritten for the benefit of a wider public his little book *When Jesus Came,* lectures given to a refresher school for clergy. In its present form it essays to do for this generation what Estlin Carpenter's well-known manual did for his, and what Edersheim and Schürer (who with Klausner and C. G. Montefiore are evaluated in the last chapter) did on the grand scale. After a sketch of Galilee and the Galileans as compared and contrasted (very favourably) with Judea and the Judeans, Canon Deane discusses with clarity the economic conditions of the time, *e.g.,* food shortage, slave competition in agriculture, and the burden of dual taxation—civil and ecclesiastical; and shows how these contributed to a universal feeling of unrest. He indicates the attitude of Jesus to such troubles. The next two chapters handle better-known topics—the popular religion and its leaders and critics; these are followed by a graphic account of home life, and a chapter on "Public Opinion and our Lord". The writer thinks that Jesus's denunciation of the Pharisees was meant especially for the "Scribes", and that it was the Sadducees who were responsible for the Crucifixion. And he would describe Jesus as a rabbi. The book is serviceable in matter and manner; it would be more so if it had an index. The printer has slipped on p. 71, l. 4, and the author on p. 101, l. 6 and p. 110—it is R. T. (not C.) Herford who is the authority on pharisaism.

Mr. Edmunds's slim paper-covered volume, "an interpretation" of *Luke* 15, has already received the warm commendation of Canon Raven and Prof. H. G. Wood. It is the work of a mind well furnished with culture ancient and modern, and of a deeply devout spirit. The reading and assimilation of it may be safely commended to pulpit and pew alike. He has a shrewd knock at D. R. Davies's assumption that man must be either an angel or a devil, and as he clearly is not the former he must be the latter; and at the Führer who (like the devil according to the teaching of the Eastern Church) is "a celibate, sober, and a vegetarian". But these are only sparks from an anvil on which the writer hammers out truth,

beauty, and love. The book is a reminder of the inexhaustible wealth of *Luke* 15.

The author of the remaining book in this list is the Director of Philosophical Studies in a Missionary College of the Roman Communion in Dublin. The sub-title of the book is "a synthesis of the principles and practices of the spiritual life", and the spiritual life is defined as man's acceptance of the offer of membership in the Kingdom proclaimed and established by Jesus. Dr. Kelly's treatment of the subject is amplified by many references to Augustine's *City of God* and man's inevitable choice between the *civitas* founded on the love of God and that founded on love of self. His aim is to expound and drive home the truth of "God's royal right to man's service". There is a great deal in the book which discriminating readers of other Communions than the author's will find helpful, *e.g.*, in the chapters on "The Law of the Kingdom" (the Beatitudes) and "The Prayer of the Kingdom". Of course there is plenty of Aquinas, and an underlining of the virtue of the Holy Mass, and a disposition to take the story of Adam very literally. It is dedicated "To Jesus my King and Mary my Queen", and there is an appalling chapter on "Mary the Queen" which reminds one of the man who had come to the conclusion that there are *four* persons in the Trinity. Still, as has been said, there is good in the egg; and although it has no index, we need not put it on the *Index Expurg.*, even if we had one.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

By Faith Alone. By H. F. LOVELL COCKS, D.D. Clarke. 10s. 6d.

If, as we are often told, there is a great revival of interest in the study of dogmatic theology, this book by Principal Lovell Cocks should do a good deal both to stimulate and satisfy it. The book is an abbreviation of a thesis which obtained the London doctorate in divinity, and is therefore necessarily somewhat academic in tone. It will certainly appeal to the theologically-minded, but it may be doubted whether the wayfaring man will find in it much to help him, though it is there if he would look for it. Dr. Cocks has affinities with those modern, and mostly younger, theologians who draw their inspiration from the Reformed theology of Luther and Calvin as mediated through the teaching of Barth and Brunner. But at the same time he retains his independence. While deeply influenced by these writers he does not hesitate to criticize and to express his disagreement. He recognizes, for example, that there is such a thing as natural religion, that God is not the wholly other but that there is a point of connection between God and man, and he repudiates the idea that we can have no concern with the Jesus of history. Also he is no obscurantist, for he writes:

> There is a crying need for the right kind of modernism. The religious vocabulary of the Bible has become an unknown tongue to our generation, and there is a call for translators and expositors.

The book falls naturally into two main divisions, the first of which deals with natural faith and the second with saving faith. By natural faith Dr. Cocks really means reason and the whole rational approach to religion. This, as expounded by Kant and Schleiermacher and their followers, he criticizes severely as mere theological humanism, a vain attempt to vindicate religious belief at the bar of Modernity. His own position as over against humanism is

> that while saving faith presupposes natural faith (since it presupposes man with all his powers and interests), it is yet by no means continuous

with it—as, for example, natural faith come to full self-consciousness or to its highest point of development—but exists in another dimension, being no innate human capacity but a gift to man through the Word of God.

Here Dr. Cocks seems to take away with one hand what he gives with the other. If there is such a thing as natural faith it would seem to involve necessarily some sort of a native capacity in man for receiving and responding to the gift and revelation of God. This may be humanism, but it is well to remember that there is a true as well as a false humanism. To ignore the human side of man's relations with God is to forget some of the plainest teaching of Jesus Christ. But this cannot fairly be charged against Dr. Cocks. One of the great merits of his book is that it is really Christian, *i.e.*, it does take account of the historic fact of Christ and the mind of Christ, and seeks to test all its findings thereby.

The second part of the book may be described as a compendium of Reformed theology. It raises all the big questions—faith in Christ, and union with Christ, justification, atonement, regeneration, election, and the like. On all of these Dr. Cocks has something fresh and helpful to say, even though he may not always command our assent. In dealing with the Atonement he is obviously very much under the influence of Dr. Forsyth, yet he concludes:

> We do not begin to approach the truth about the Atonement until we see the penal satisfaction and moral influence theories not as mutually exclusive but as complementary.

Dr. Cocks is very shy of predestination and not altogether convincing in his attempt to show how election does not necessarily involve reprobation. In dealing with repentance he carries us with him when he suggests that something more than mere repentance or confession is needed as a condition of forgiveness. But he overlooks, as so many do, the one condition laid down by Jesus Christ, namely, that we too should forgive as we wish to be forgiven. Nevertheless, Dr. Cocks's treatment of saving faith as a function of the whole man is very fine and stimulating. It is deeply religious as well as theological, and involves much more than assent to a creed. As he says:

> Where saving faith is identified with the believer's assent to a body of doctrine we are at the furthest remove from anything that can be regarded as a personal encounter of the believer with his Saviour and a personal assurance of forgiveness.

This book is a good illustration of the truth that it is the heart that makes the theologian. Some will welcome it for its learning and its logic, but many more because it speaks to them out of a living experience of the deep things of God. We hope it will be widely read and that, in due time, Dr. Cocks will give us more. W. B. SELBIE.

He Who Is: A Study in Traditional Theism. By E. L. MASCALL. Longmans. 15s.

Fr. Mascall disarms criticism at the outset by telling us that the primary purpose of his book is purely academic. It is an essay in "the basic problem of natural theology". At the same time it has a very practical bearing, because what men think about God and ultimate reality must always profoundly influence their actions and outlook. We wish that he had made more of this aspect of his subject. But he evidently regards it as a digression and gladly confines himself to its more theoretical and academic treatment. And, let it be said at once, he has made a very successful job of it. To many students of theology the traditional theistic arguments are

very dry bones indeed, but Fr. Mascall has made even these dry bones live. He is a convinced Thomist, and his enthusiasm for the Angelic Doctor, even for those who cannot share it, adds point and freshness to his treatment of the most arid themes.

The book begins by emphasizing the importance of the doctrine of God and asking what meaning we are to attach to that name. Fr. Mascall agrees with St. Thomas that we can best think of God as self-subsistent being. This definition, he considers, so far from being "an arid and lifeless philosophical abstraction is fertile of all the fulness of Catholic devotion". He then goes on to show how experience and revelation may each of them make some contribution to our knowledge of God, even though it is very much less than is often claimed. This brings him to his main theme, which is the traditional approach to the arguments for the being of God as set forth in the theology of St. Thomas. After a careful and detailed examination of the famous "five points", Fr. Mascall concludes:

> It was seen that the arguments depend upon the recognition of finite beings as possessing both being and finitude. They are arguments from finite being as such and not from any special kind of finite being: and, while they cannot give us a knowledge of what God is in his inner essence, they can tell us a great deal about him from the fact that he is the ultimate source of all being other than his own.

The latter half of the book deals with such subjects as the relation between intellect and intuition in theology, God and the world, developing the doctrine of *analogia entis*, the divine attributes, transcendence and immanence; and it concludes with a reasoned criticism of the cosmologies of A. N. Whitehead and F. R. Tennant. It is all very interesting, carefully worked out, and abundantly illustrated from everyday life and the writings of a multitude of scholars. But for all that it leaves the reader with the feeling of a task only half done. The God of the Thomist system may be the unmoved mover, or the great first cause, or the supreme architect, but he is not the God of Christian worship and devotion. As the present Dean of St. Paul's has said:

> *Deus philosophorum* is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Those who thought out the (Thomist) system in spite of their profoundly Christian experience did not succeed in fusing the Aristotelian metaphysic with the Christian Gospel. We cannot believe in the Deity who emerges from their logic not because he is too high but because he does not really sustain the Christian values.

Fr. Mascall quotes this opinion and tries to meet it. But his criticism is not very convincing. We may all agree with him as to the immense importance of establishing the being of God on rational grounds. But it is equally important to know what kind of a God he is. Logic cannot tell us this. It needs to be supplemented by revelation and in experience, and these are more important than the writer of this book and those who follow him are willing to admit.

W. B. Selbie.

The Cross and the Eternal Order. A study of the Atonement in its Cosmic Significance. By Henry W. Clark, D.D. Lutterworth Press. 14s.

The aim of this book is to develop a Pauline philosophy of the universe, in which the Incarnation and the Atonement find their proper place. It is Paul's "thought-series" which Dr. Clark seeks to discover and to expound.

The foundation of the whole scheme is the doctrine of the Trinity, and especially of the Eternal Son, as He sustains towards the universe the

functions of creation, immanence, and redemption. His immanence is twofold. It is (1) a general immanence by which all things consist: in man this immanence exists in the unconscious region of his being. But (2) beyond this general immanence there is a special immanence by which the Eternal Son since the creation of man has inhabited his consciousness as a light leading him to God. It is in connexion with this special immanence that the Atonement is to be understood. Man turned away in sin from the Divine light and leading; but God in His love began the work of his redemption by the Incarnation of the Eternal Son in the historical Christ.

The Incarnation was not directed against particular sins, but against universal sinfulness. What God had in view was a "large-scale" or cosmic redemption. It is within this large-scale redemptive movement that the Death and Resurrection of Christ have their place. Christ's death is to be understood as the withdrawal of the immanence of the Eternal Son, not only from the historical Jesus, but also from humanity as a whole. Paul says that Christ died "unto sin"; and this is taken to mean that He abandoned sinful humanity, so that from His death onwards it is literally Christless. But the abandonment only took place in order that a fresh beginning might be made: with the Resurrection commences the renewal of the immanence of the Eternal Christ in a redeemed humanity. For, next, on the basis of the large-scale redemptive movement just described, there follows a "small-scale" redemptive ministry, in which God's love presses the remedy for sinfulness upon individual men in their sins. It is by faith that they receive the indwelling of the Eternal and Living Christ in their hearts through the Holy Spirit, and so are individually redeemed.

In the work of redemption the whole Trinity is concerned as One: all such ideas as an appeasement of the Father by the Son are absolutely unallowable. There is no help in the modern defence of penal substitution by saying that it is God Himself who suffers for sin: it

> goes far towards making God blindfold Himself and act out an almost theatrical representation of justice in order to evade the demands of His own law.

The relation between God's justice and His love is altogether different. His redemptive action in the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ is itself an act of pardon: its reverse side is the abiding of His wrath upon those who reject the Living Christ and remain Christless.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Clark has written a notable book, whose value goes far beyond the above outline. It displays a most devout spirit combined with great learning, its argument is both subtle and vigorous, and it contains many sound and penetrating judgments. These things are recognized by Prof. C. H. Dodd in his "Foreword": he further notes (evidently with approval) Dr. Clark's refusal to dissociate theology from philosophy, and says that his thesis demands deliberate and critical consideration. It is by this thesis that Dr. Clark's work must be finally judged.

By his return upon Paul and his close study of the Apostle's teaching, Dr. Clark establishes himself firmly in the great Christian theological tradition. Paul was the first Christian theologian, and practically all subsequent theology has been developed in one way or another from his teaching. But, as Baur long ago pointed out, and as Dr. Clark recognizes, there are many lacunæ in the Pauline thought; and these can be filled out in different ways; as, for instance, by Calvin and by Ritschl. Moreover, it makes a great deal of difference from what centre we start to organize the whole. The special *differentia* of Dr. Clark's work is the emphasis that he puts on the cosmic element in Paul's thought: he believes that it can be successfully

worked out into a complete philosophy, while at the same time he makes it the centre from which to interpret the rest of the Apostle's teaching. Work along these lines results in bringing Dr. Clark near to the theology of the Greek Fathers, as he himself is conscious. The crucial point of his doctrine is the statement that the death on the Cross meant the withdrawal of the Eternal Christ from sinful humanity, in order that a new humanity might be begun with the Resurrection. This is not quite the Greek doctrine, which is rather that by the death of Christ humanity was purged from sin, while it was delivered from death by His resurrection. In fact, Dr. Clark's theory is strangely reminiscent of something older than the classical Greek theology, the Gnostic doctrine according to which at the Crucifixion the Aeon Christus departed from the human Jesus. But Dr. Clark and the Greeks are at one in implying the philosophical doctrine of the reality of universals: he and they alike teach that what took place at the Cross affected "humanity" as a whole rather than individual men. The resemblance goes further; for they, like Dr. Clark, add to this "large-scale" redemption a "small-scale" redemptive ministry, which they teach is through faith and the sacraments.

What, then, is in the end to be said of Dr. Clark's thesis? His return to the Gnostics is certainly no improvement upon the classical Greek theology; but apart from this, his doctrine, like that of the Greeks, must stand or fall by the truth or falsity of the philosophical doctrine of the reality of universals. Now it must be admitted that this doctrine harmonizes with the cosmic ideas of Paul's Greco-Jewish *Weltanschauung*: the doctrine of the reality of universals only gives a more precise form to thoughts utilized by Paul in his exposition of Christianity to the Gentiles. And we can well understand how the Greek Fathers, who belonged to the same age of the world as the Apostle, felt at home with his cosmic thought and sought to develop it, and a related theology, with more exactitude and fullness. But this part of the Apostle's doctrine is not that which can be literally followed today. It belongs, not to what is permanent and necessary, but to what was temporary and expedient in his Evangel. William of Ockham settled the question of the reality of universals once for all when he asked, if the doctrine be true, how was it that "humanity" was saved in Peter and damned in Judas? The notion of a "cosmic" redemption, prior to the actual redemption of individual men, must be given up as meaningless. While a philosophic theology is a prime necessity for the Church today, Paul's cosmic thought cannot be made the basis of it. Nor can it be made the starting point for our appreciation of Paulinism: the right place from which to begin is the Apostle's doctrine of justification by faith.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Tree of Life. By H. J. MASSINGHAM. Chapman & Hall. 8s. 6d.

We have enjoyed so much that Mr. H. J. Massingham has written that it is disappointing to find him so petulant and even cantankerous. Once when we opened a book by him we expected to feel the wind on our brows and behold a far-stretching land; now we are in a library, with the windows closed—and we can generally tell what Mr. Massingham has been reading: Tawney last time, Niebuhr this. "Modernism" and "progress" are scathingly dealt with, but it is Puritanism which makes Mr. Massingham lose his head and talk nonsense: "the whole Puritan view" is "satanic"; the "Puritan conspiracy" exalted work for its own sake; our (for whom does Mr. Massingham speak?) "teeth have been set on edge by inheriting the economic fruits of Puritanism"; Puritanism "has always been hostile to the peasantry" and its "hatred of nature coincided with the thoroughly worldly

preoccupation with economic power". And, of course, the Commonwealth destroyed play and dancing and "silenced the musical soul of rural England". Perhaps from the way he swallows Tawney and Niebuhr whole Mr. Massingham might turn to other books—we suggest Mr. Scholes's *The Puritans and Music*. Puritanism is never defined, and the sentences quoted will suggest that Mr. Massingham's history is not altogether reliable: we noted on p. 140 that the date of the Luddite riots was wrong—it is correct on p. 157.

Nevertheless, and in spite of the fact that Mr. Massingham's eyes are so constantly on tradition and the past, his book has much to teach us: it reminds us that a right attitude towards nature implies a right attitude towards God, that as Jesus Himself was an out-of-doors man, so Christianity is essentially a religion of nature; it insists that outraged nature always vindictates her rights, and that deforestation and the rape of the soil bring a sure nemesis; and it pleads for a return of the Church to the earth, a synthesis of religion, nature, craft, and husbandry. But let Mr. Massingham speak for himself:

> Thus, a society which violates the natural law vindicates its truth as indefeasibly as one that obeys it. This law is at once Christian and natural; it was personalized by the rural Christ, propagated by the primitive Church, sewn into the social fabric by the craft-guilds and the village community, philosophically and imaginatively interpreted by the early 17th century, dramatized by Shakespeare and broken by Hobbes and Descartes. That breakage has led to results proliferating into every social, economic, industrial and agricultural activity; it has denatured nature, man and the food he eats and it has brought upon the stage of history a being propertyless, homeless, rootless, natureless, peaceless and godless, robbed of his self-determination and debauched by propaganda and parasitic mass-amusement. But because the despair of this being is reaching the limits of his suffering and endurance, he will rediscover the natural law in which God ordains Nature and Man to play a duality of parts, and for the lack of which he perishes. Tertullian said: "Nature is the teacher, the soul the pupil".
>
> By the time of the Restoration, he says ["he" is Mr. R. H. Tawney, and it is not easy to say where Tawney ends and Massingham begins], the Tudor clash between Christian morality and economic interests has been decided and the theory of the application of a Christian standard to economic conduct had surrendered. Theology surrendered to ethics, ethics to economics, and man followed suit from a spiritual being to an economic animal. The terms of surrender are indeed explicitly set out by the Tonnage Act of 1694, by which the king handed over his prerogative in the issue of money to a private interest in the newly created Bank of England. Thus the Bank of England took precedence of the Church of England by relieving economics of Christian supervision and giving it into the charge of itself. The mediaeval idea that it was right for a man to seek the wealth necessary for his livelihood in his particular station but wrong for him to seek more, and that that kind of enterprise was the sin of avarice, was dissolved in the acid of an expediency that could not but justify usury as the legitimate exercise of self-interest.

Perhaps some of our readers can explain the meaning of the sentence:

> Pelagius, a heretic of the Roman, was a member of the British Church, which was only very lightly episcopal and disciplinary.

EDITOR.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Ever since the Rev. George Barclay's *The Making and Meaning of the Bible* we have looked eagerly at anything from his pen. **The Bible Speaks to Our Day* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) contains seven sermons—"lectures", Mr. Barclay calls them, but they are good preaching, and when we say that they have all the qualities of George Adam Smith's *Isaiah* preachers will hasten to buy them.

For devotional reading we recommend Dr. John Macbeath's *A Wayfarer's Psalter* (Marshall, 6s.), which gives a page meditation on each of the Psalms. The book is worth its value for the quotation from James Gilmour alone:

> When I find I cannot make headway in devotion I open the Bible at the Psalms, and push in my canoe, and let myself be carried along in the stream of devotion which flows through the whole book; the current always sets towards God and in most places is strong and deep.

Father Hubert Van Zeller's *From Creation to Christmas* (Burns, 7s. 6d.), with eight of William Hole's illustrations, aims at relating the *Old Testament* story in unbroken narrative, using Scripture language or a paraphrase of it. So we have:

> The Fathers of the Church have always understood Eve to be a foreshadowing of Our Lady (with so to speak, a very great difference).

This passage we do not recognize in *Genesis* or any other part of the *O.T.* And there are others.

By his articles in the *Evangelical Quarterly* Mr. F. F. Bruce has shown himself a competent *N.T.* scholar, and it is, we hope, an encouraging sign that the Inter-Varsity Fellowship publishes his *Are the N.T. Documents Reliable?* (1s. 6d.). Mr. Bruce will not satisfy radical critics, but he knows his way about, and all students, and not only those in circles that are biblically conservative, will find his little book a useful introduction to the study of the *N.T.* Mr. Bruce has also edited the late Dr. D. M. McIntyre's *Some Notes on the Gospels* (I.V.F., 1s. 6d.).

For its Lenten book, the Congregational Union has turned to Lyndhurst Road Church, Hampstead, from which has come many a book of challenge and comfort. **The Drama of the Cross* (Independent Press, 5s.) is, we think, the Rev. C. Stanley Herbert's first book. It is not only full of promise, but it shows that Mr. Herbert possesses something of the skill of Lyndhurst Road's first minister—the power to present the Christian Gospel with cogency and appeal to his contemporaries. Mr. Herbert takes the *dramatis personæ* in the tragedy of the crucifixion of Jesus and shows how representative they are of mankind in our own and every age. The Epilogue is a moving account of the work of Jesus on the Cross and its meaning for sinful men.

The welcome return to Biblical theology is seen in the Bishop of London's Lent Book, the Rev. Alec R. Vidler's **Christ's Strange Work* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), an examination of God's Law in which the *O.T.* is given its rightful place. That Law must be strictly obeyed—

> (1) by taking our political responsibilities seriously as our duty to God, rather than as our ideals for humanity; (2) by hearing and proclaiming God's summons to repentance; and (3) by seeing that our new life as Christians and as a Christian community is one in which God's Law is

our standard and guide, while Christ's righteousness alone is our justification.

Mr. Vidler leans heavily on Brunner and the continental theologians, but with these he draws on the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and many others, among whom we are glad to see Leighton. Indeed, there is an apt quotation on almost every page; if we dare use the adjective where Mr. Vidler is concerned, to read the quotations alone is a liberal education!

A Symposium is the despair of a reviewer, especially in days of restricted space, when little more can be done than indicate its components. If those who write in *What the Cross Means to Me* (Clarke, 7s. 6d.) ever met together, it must have been a lively party, for they cover almost every aspect of theological thought except that which deems that Jesus never lived at all. They are (omitting titles): Harold E. Brierley, C. J. Cadoux, D. R. Davies, Bede Frost, A. E. Garvie, John A. Hughes, Evgheny Lampert, H. D. A. Major, J. Middleton Murry, Conrad Noel, Richard Roberts, H. Wheeler Robinson, Victor White, Charles Williams, C. J. Wright.

There is nothing that is new in the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton's *Christ and Human Values* (Lutterworth Press, 4s. 6d.), but its message is timely because timeless, and his earnestness makes his words appealing. Would that they could be heard and answered by the peoples of the world, including that Japan where Mr. Walton laboured so faithfully!

The Master of the Temple's **I Believe in God* (Muller, 1s. 6d.) is an admirable sketch and just the thing to place in the hands of an intelligent seeker.

We were glad to read of the new series, "Problems of Worship", to be edited by the Deans of Liverpool and St. Paul's. The first volume, *English Prayer Books* (Cambridge Press, 6s.), is a mine of information, with a very useful bibliography. The work of a Roman Catholic, Mr. Stanley Morison, it is strongest on the pre-Reformation period, though the pages dealing with the revival of liturgiology in this country since Palmer are very good. On the whole Mr. Morison's liturgiology—especially his descriptions of the varied uses and of the format in which they appear—is stronger than his history: the references to Protestantism are altogether inadequate. So far as we remember, there is no reference to the Genevan and Middelburg Service Books used by English Protestants, and the selection from the many service books available for Free Church use today is haphazard and arbitrary. Mr. Morison prints two examples of "present-day vocational services", which he thinks are making a place for themselves; they illustrate the dangers as well as the possibilities of such services: we can imagine men of the Royal and Merchant Navies finding in the "Anthem of the Sea" opportunity for ribaldry rather than devotion! But Mr. Morison has given us a piece of work which must have its place on the reference shelf of all interested in liturgiology.

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft's **The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) deserves careful study. The trouble of the Church, he urges, is not oppression, but the fact that it is not truly the Church. We live in a time when the Church is both being destroyed and being rebuilt. The direct line from the old to the new people of God is traced (a very good chapter this), then we are told how the Church is rebuilt and its unity reconstituted, and finally what a renewed Church means for world reconstruction. Dr. Visser 't Hooft is often searching, but we doubt if his cure is radical enough; we believe the surgery must be much more drastic, removing tissue infected by disease, before the Church can be the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church which can speak to the world. The

translators have done their work well, though we believe "congregation" should have been used where they choose "parish".

In *Christian Counter-Attack* (S.C.M., 6s.) the Revs. Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H. M. Waddams, and R. R. Williams describe the stand of the Churches of Europe against Nazism. It is a stirring story, and one which testifies to the perennial source of strength by which the life of the Church has been maintained through persecution and oppression. Perhaps the survey would have been even more impressive had the outlook not been so uniformly rose-coloured: a chapter beginning with the unqualified statement, "The Eastern Orthodox Church has been the bearer of the flag of freedom in Eastern Europe for many centuries" is likely to instil doubt rather than confidence.

No Other Gospel (S.C.M., 2s.) contains six sermons on the Church conflict on the Continent preached in St. Benet's Church, Cambridge, by the Revs. J. O. Cobham, A. G. Hebert, F. Hildebrandt, N. Micklem, A. R. Vidler, and R. R. Williams. Mr. Vidler raises in acute form the problem of the Christian State. Can there be such a State, or must there be total separation between State and Church?

In *Into Action* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) Dr. A. M. Chirgwin has gathered together in interesting fashion facts concerning the problems that face the Church of Christ—the Jews, Church and State, religious freedom, Colonies, race, and youth. He then outlines "Christian Post-War Policy" on the lines of the London Missionary Society's "New Advance" programme. Dr. Chirgwin's survey is satisfactory if it be taken as an introduction to a study of the situation, but we have a feeling that it too does not go deep enough. He repeats, *e.g.*, all the *clichés* about the failure of Cowper-Temple education and argues for definite religious instruction in the schools, utterly ignoring the fact that the schools which have given such instruction, Catholic and Anglican, have produced no better results than the provided schools. It looks as if we shall have to wait another generation before the Church recognizes that it is far more important to have Christian teachers in schools than Christian teaching. In the same way we believe we shall have to learn—at one point in his book Dr. Chirgwin seems to be about to touch the point—that it is more important to send into Europe and every other continent Christian traders, bankers, workmen, than it is to send Christian missionaries. We hope Dr. Chirgwin will give us—what we hoped to find in this book—an examination of missionary policy not so dependent on what might be called the professional missionary.

Mr. Paul B. Anderson's **People, Church and State in Modern Russia* (S.C.M., 6s.) will be found most useful for those who wish to understand the position of religion in Russia since the Revolution. Bishop Arseny's statement, "the landlords and the Church stand together", indicates why Soviet advocates say the Orthodox Church actively opposed the Revolution and therefore had to be suppressed. Mr. Anderson gives an admirable summary of the Party attitude to religion and of the rise and fall of the "godless movement", and then outlines recent changes in administration. There is a good chapter too on the relationship between the Orthodox Church and Western Christendom. This book and the forthcoming Report of a Committee of which Prof. John Macmurray is Chairman should do much to throw light on the religious situation in Russia yesterday and today. But what about tomorrow?

In **A Pilgrim's Further Progress* (Blackwell, 10s. 6d.) Dr. C. J. Cadoux tries the dialogue as a method of expounding the teaching of Liberal Protestantism. We cannot say the method is a success; Interpreters may speak

like Dr. Cadoux's interpreter, but never Pilgrim spoke like this pilgrim, not even in modern Oxford. "Suppose now, for the sake of argument, we agree tentatively to your adumbrated synthesis", he remarks, and in another place, "But would you care to remind me at this stage of the salient points?" The truth is that colloquial speech does not come easily to Dr. Cadoux, and his touch is not light enough for a *genre* in which only a genius like Plato could succeed. That being said, it must be recognized that students will find the dialogues both thought-provoking and thought-clearing. Dr. Cadoux knows what he believes and can give an account of the faith that is in him, and he does so with courage and conviction. Sections VI and VII, on "Prayer" and "The One Church", seemed to us specially good, though we have no doubt many will be equally grateful for the doctrinal chapters. The last chapter, "Sex", is the weakest: it will confirm in their views those who accept Dr. Cadoux's premisses, but we cannot see it converting an opponent. The volume would make a good textbook for a group of ministers, and if they desire something for those who inquire "What is Liberal Protestantism?" they need look no further.

Time and again in reading the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith's ***Interpreters of Man*** (Lutterworth Press, 15s.) we have been reminded of a very different book, Dr. G. P. Gooch's *History of Historians*. In the same way, and with the same skill, the books expound the chosen authorities, and leave the reader in heavy debt. The interpreters whom Mr. Griffith interprets (and some of them badly need it) are Hegel, Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard, Mazzini, Newman, Nietzsche, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Ritschl, Schweitzer, Harnack, Rathenau, Spengler, H. G. Wells Pareto, Berdyaev, Bertrand Russell, and Barth. He thus surveys the collapse of humanism and the failure of science and philosophy, as well as of materialistic Communism, National Socialism, and democracy as we have known it. The natural goodness of man and all the resources of man's brain have failed to create the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and the world today cries out that man needs a gospel of salvation. We agree, but the modern fashion of belabouring humanism may cause us to forget that there is a Christian humanism on and by which the new order must be built, and we are by no means prepared to discard the Renaissance and the Reformation, and the positive gains they have given us. Mr. Griffith has, however, written a very timely and helpful book. An abbreviation has become initials on p. 30n, and "it" has become "its" on p. 70.

Protestants, if they are wise, recognize that they have much to learn from the Church of Rome about the art of prayer, and there are few of them who would not benefit by reading Father Eugene Boylan's *Difficulties in Mental Prayer* (Dublin: Gill, 5s.). The book may be deemed an exposition of Teresa's words:

> Mental prayer is nothing else but an intimate friendship, a frequent converse, heart to heart, with Him Whom we know to be our Lover.

It is full of sound counsel—as, *e.g.*, to develop in conversation with Jesus the four ends for which Mass is offered,

> to adore God, to praise Him and thank Him for all His gifts, to atone for our sins, and to beg His grace and mercy.

Those who wish to go on to practise the contemplative life should read Ruysbroeck's *The Seven Steps of the Ladder of Spiritual Love* (Dacre Press, 3s. 6d.), translated by Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor and introduced by Father Joseph Bolland. If in some ways Ruysbroeck is a good guide, readers will be well advised not to follow his gardening methods,

for he worked with one hand, while telling his beads with the other, nor did he distinguish the flowers and vegetables from the weeds, but pulled up all in his holy and humble ardour.

It seemed natural to turn from these books to Prof. E. F. Jacob's *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch* (Manchester Univ. Press, 10s. 6d.), and we read first those dealing with the Brethren of the Common Life, *De Imitatione Christi*, and Cusanus, noting that Prof. Jacob supports the claim of Thomas of Kempen to *De Imitatione*. It was not these essays, strangely enough, that we found most interesting and helpful, but the four on "Conciliar Thought", "Dietrich of Niem", "Englishmen and the General Councils of the Fifteenth Century", and "English Conciliar Activity, 1395—1418", which are packed with information and shrewd comment. The remaining essays deal with Ockham, Sir John Fortescue, and " 'Middle Ages' and 'Renaissance' ". Prof. Jacob has a wide knowledge of continental sources, but his references to authorities in English sometimes appear scanty; *e.g.*, though he makes use of Dr. Henry Bett's *Nicholas of Cusa* he does not mention the works of Dr. Rufus Jones. More annoying is the quoting of "a distinguished scholar" without naming him, though perhaps *we* are to blame here, both for not recognizing the quotation, and for desiring to place it, for four pages later the words of *De Imitatione* are quoted: "Search not who spoke this or that, but mark what is spoken"!

Dr. John C. Heenan's *Cardinal Hinsley* (Burns, 8s. 6d.) is so readable that we hope any full-dress biography of the Cardinal will be entrusted to him. This memoir begins with the funeral, despises chronology, and is sparing of dates, but it brings alive the bluff and obstinate Yorkshireman. Catholic and patriot—he fiercely objected when the order was reversed—Hinsley was unexpectedly called to be Archbishop of Westminster when approaching seventy, and he made a place for himself in our national life. Perhaps his best work was done as Rector of the Venerabile in Rome: certainly the best pages of this book, those most revealing the man, describe his life there. For the rest Dr. Heenan is a propagandist, not of his subject —for there is a pleasing absence of the flattery which marks some ecclesiastical biographies—but of his Church. He has to explain away Hinsley's "helpless old man" speech and the apparent change of policy in regard to the "Sword of the Spirit" movement, and to get round other awkward corners. At times his blinkers and the alacrity with which he knocks down men of straw will give rise to amusement, but they will do no harm, and Protestants will do well to read this account of a fearless divine who believed wholeheartedly in the Church of which he came to be one of the Princes.

Mr. Stuart Hodgson has edited a memorial volume to Ramsay Muir, and it is no disparagement of the many distinguished contributors to *Ramsay Muir* (Lund, 8s. 6d.) to say that the chapters of autobiography at the beginning throw the rest of the book into the shade. Indeed, we must frankly confess that it is a long time since a book moved us so much as did this account of the Scotch boy of the Manse left fatherless and making his way to a life of learning and service. There will long be debate whether Muir was right to leave a History Chair for politics; certainly it was his misfortune to serve a Party which somehow ceased to appeal to a mass of Liberal opinion in the country. Had he been appointed Vice-Chancellor of a modern University or of the University of Calcutta, his unusual combination of gifts might have found their proper scope. There are many things in these chapters we should like to quote—the account of the religious faith he lost and the one he found; the descriptions of visits to the Continent, America, India; and some good stories. But we must content ourselves with a warm

commendation of the book: from it readers will learn, and they will enjoy learning.

Dr. A. D. Lindsay introduces Prof. Oskar Kraus's *Albert Schweitzer, His Work and His Philosophy* (Black, 6s.), written in 1926 (second edition, 1929), and now translated into English. Kraus was Prof. of Philosophy in Prague; after being in a concentration camp he reached England, and died in Oxford in 1942. In the camp he determined to discover how Franz Brentano's proof of the existence of God could be made flawless; Brentano he deemed "the greatest and most talented of modern thinkers", and Schweitzer's work suffered because Brentano was long unknown to him. Prof. Kraus discusses Schweitzer's inconsistencies, finding his mysticism

> nothing more or less than a logically unjustifiable short cut to a desired aim which he is unable to attain in a logically justifiable way or which he prematurely despairs of ever attaining.

It is not Schweitzer's metaphysical weakness, but his "supreme ethical achievement", which most impresses Kraus, as it impresses us; we see again that though "Jesus' metaphysics were such worlds apart from his own", his motives in devoting the whole of his life after thirty to the service of men were similar to those of Jesus, and this is

> psychologically the most remarkable factor in his whole personality: he went to Africa as an atonement, an act of vicarious reparation for the sins of omission and thoughtlessness [committed by the white man against the black].

From the indefatigable but lively Father Aloysius Roche come *A Bedside Book of English Saints* and *A Bedside Book of Irish Saints* (Burns, 6s. each)—the mixture as before, in the author's words,

> the merest gleanings of the harvest, chips and fragments and odds and ends of history, legend and tradition laid out in rows, roughly assorted with a minimum of classification, like—well! rather like the trinkets and *bric-à-brac* one sees on stalls at a Rummage Sale.

Not uninteresting, nevertheless, and sometimes with a new "slant" on a Saint. We prefer straightforward chapter headings to Father Roche's fancy ones.

Dr. Walter Lowrie must dream of Kierkegaard by night and think of him by day. His *Short Life* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) of Kierkegaard may be recommended to those who have not time for the fuller one. Its American production gives it a sumptuous appearance; paper, print, margins, make it a delight to read after many British "war economy productions". Is Dr. Lowrie right in thinking that the English speak of "a dealer in slops" for one who sells ready-made clothing?

To say we have been disappointed in Dr. G. G. Coulton's *Fourscore Years* (Cambridge Press, 21s.) is not to say that we have not received much pleasure in reading it: its writer has such observant eyes, such keen enthusiasms, and such unusual industry and pertinacity that he will be a dull dog who does not enjoy this autobiography. But much of the volume is devoted to a Coulton the young, and even middle-aged, do not know—the Coulton who was a curate and a schoolmaster. Not until we reach p. 300 do we have our author married and settled down to his life-work in Cambridge. Fortunately we get a chapter on Controversy, and one on the long fight to reveal Gasquet's blunders, but nothing like enough to show us the doughty fighter and the research student at work. There may, however, be those who will find the story of Dr. Coulton's youth and education, his teaching experience and his travels, of greater interest, and for them

the table is well spread. Good stories abound, and some unhappy ones, as that of F. W. H. Myers's cribbing of lines for his prize poem.

Mr. Frank Lea's **Carlyle, Prophet of Today* (Routledge, 8s. 6d.) reminds us of a brilliant boy who matures late. It begins badly, very badly, and then suddenly becomes alive, revealing in its criticism of the past and pertinent in the application of that criticism to the present. In discussing Cromwell and the relation of Cromwell's religion to democracy, Mr. Lea has vital things to say, as also when he discusses Carlyle's lack of belief in equality and fraternity, and the lack of reverence for individual personality (a pre-Christian attitude exemplified in Plato) which marked Carlyle's later years. A study of Carlyle's works, including *Frederick the Great,* leads to the final conclusion that

> only a re-born religion can save Europe. Neither Germany nor Russia nor England can be redeemed except by the birth of a new reverence for the sanctity of the individual: and without redemption, there can be no amity between them. Only a religion that inspires and insists upon this reverence is capable of providing the dynamic of a new Christendom.

Dr. W. B. Secretan's *A Mixed Bag* (Reading: Bradley, 6s.) are the pleasant and unpretentious "Recollections and Reflections of a Surgeon". Dr. Secretan has the likes and dislikes of the medical man of his period—the dislikes include jazz, Germans, nail-varnish and anti-vivisectionists. From Guy's in the nineties he went to help to lay the first Pacific Cable, and had other adventures before settling down as a surgeon in Reading. We found the chapters dealing with his work of greater interest than those dealing with hobbies and holidays, but altogether the book gave us a pleasant evening's reading.

Mr. Ernest Sommer's *Into Exile* (New Europe Co., 7s. 6d.), "The History of the Counter-Reformation in Bohemia", serves to remind us that in the 17th century, as in the 20th, the Czech people suffered oppression, brutality, and exile. The British and the Czechs have links which go back to Wyclif and Hus, and we should not forget the courage of the Hussites in the Thirty Years' War any more than we should forget our betrayal of the Czechs in 1938. If in Mr. Sommer's too-packed narrative we can sometimes scarcely see the wood for the trees, at others we find it thrilling and moving. There is a useful bibliography.

Prof. Preston Slosson pays a graceful tribute to his collaborator, the late R. B. Mowat, in the Preface to *History of the English-Speaking Peoples* (Oxford Press, 21s.). The two Professors of History set themselves a difficult task in surveying in one volume the story of the British people, scattered over every continent, and the American people, but on the whole they have succeeded: the bibliographies are useful, the maps adequate if not elegant, and the narrative readable. The book will no doubt be widely used; these corrections for further editions should be noted: 29, Westmoreland; 44, Albigensian (this perhaps the result of too many detective stories); 79, Wyclif died 1384, not 1382; 88 Poyning's Law 1494, not 1495; 101, pounds stirling; 120, The Independents "favored a policy of making each individual congregation a law unto itself in doctrine and in ritual"; never in *doctrine,* we think; 400, sentence does not read; 409, "disapponited"; 464, the London Missionary Society was formed in 1795, not 1794 (date is correct on 476). Spelling of Lafayette is not uniform, and his index entries are incomplete. In general the writers carried us with them, the only place where we demurred being the statement that from 1904 to 1914

> the peace-loving British public had the unpleasant sensation of sliding

irresistibly towards a precipice of war which they could see but might be unable to avoid.

We should say they refused to believe there was a precipice.

The Rev. J. G. Patton knows the Congregationalism of the East Riding of Yorkshire as few people do, and he has now written a history of the Swanland Church to which he ministers. *A Country Independent Chapel* (Brown, 7s. 6d.) takes the story back beyond 1693, when the church was founded, to a chantry in 1444 or even before that date. From 1693 down to the present there is a list of ministers, while among the laymen Sir James Reckitt (1833—1924) stands out. There are some good photographs, and we are glad that of the Chapel shows the pond. We know of no other Congregational Chapel so pleasantly situated.

Having aroused the curiosity of his readers by contrasting the Democratic platform of 1932 with the policies of President Roosevelt, Mr. James Burnham in *The Machiavellians* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.) seems to swerve violently from his purpose. Not so, really, for the author of *The Managerial Revolution* well knows what he is about, and in this arrogant book he has a definite theory to expound. First he outlines—and defends—the outlook and method of Machiavelli, having prepared the way by a glance at *De Monarchia;* then, in the most useful part of the book, he summarizes the teachings of the modern Machiavellians, Mosca, Sorel, Michels, and Pareto; and finally, he applies their teaching to the present day.

Naturally the standpoint is cynical and amoral; politics is the science of the struggle for power; political science studies what men do and not what they say, and it recognizes that it is a delusion to believe that logical or rational action determines the steps men take; the people are not the important part of the community, but the *élite,* whose primary object is to maintain its power, and its methods, force and fraud. Thus "democratic self-government is ruled out for the future as it has been absent from the past". The Machiavellians are the only ones who have told the truth about power: "no theory, no promises, no morality, no amount of good will, no religion will restrain power".

It will be seen that Mr. Burnham is very provocative; there is a good deal in history to which he shuts his eyes, even as he avoids "problems of subjective moral evaluation" which would cut across his argument.

We have "content" for "contend" on p. 86; and "Kark Marx" on p. 191 looks a real gangster.

That books on education need not be hard to read was proved by R. H. Quick and appears also in Prof. A. N. Whitehead's fragment of autobiography printed in an Appendix to Dr. Maxwell Garnett's *The World We Mean To Make* (Faber, 10s. 6d.), of which the second part of the title—*and the part of education in making it*—is perhaps the more important. Dr. Garnett is always so well informed, so sound in judgment, and so wise in suggestion, that we cannot but wish he possessed the added gift of attractive style. But when one has so much it is churlish to complain, and, when educational policy in this country is in a plastic state, it is well that we have a book which surveys the whole of our education and outlines not merely the possibilities but the ideals which should guide it. We commend the book to our readers: it would make an admirable textbook for group study. Details on pp. 52, 70, and 139 need attention.

Mr. M. Alderton Pink's *Social Reconstruction* is worth its place in an excellent—and cheap—series, Nelson's "Discussion Books" (3s.). Mr. Pink always writes with clarity, and a group taking this as a textbook would have sound and stimulating guidance. It would be specially provocative to

those who think that once the war is won we are to revert to the old ways and announce that measures of social progress cannot be afforded; there are more of them than is often thought, and the sooner their eyes are opened the better. Not the least instructive of Mr. Pink's pages are those in which he draws on the recent experience of the Scandinavian countries.

No man is better fitted to talk about the Colonies than Lord Hailey, and we are glad that the lectures in *The Future of Colonial Peoples* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) were delivered to an American audience. Lord Hailey was concerned with the Colonies of the other Powers, as well as those of Britain; to a crisp summary of the past he adds an apt survey of the present and wise words about the future.

Mr. Victor Gollancz calls Edmond Fleg's *Why I am a Jew* (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.) a "proud and humble little book" and "the noblest exposition of Judaism and what is called 'Jewishness' which has come my way". Fleg lost his religion but found it again, and for his unborn grandson wrote this moving account of the process and of what Judaism had come to mean.

Readers of Father Arthur Day's chatty, even garrulous, *Our Friends the Jews* (Burns, 3s. 6d.) will learn a good deal about the religion, traditions, and practice of the Jews. Father Day is a Jesuit septuagenarian whose mission it has been to learn all he could about the Jews; he has attended their meetings and festivals, engaged in oral and written controversy with them, and endeavoured, without much success, to convert them to his own religion. In an Afterword he naïvely reviews his own book, saying that no work by an English Catholic covers the same ground, admitting errors and the need of revision and reinforcement, but urging that but for the war "inaccuracies might have been reduced to a smaller minimum"—whatever that might be.

As a footnote the Rev. Stanley B. James's *A Catholic Angle on the Jewish Problem* (Paternoster Publications, 4d.) should be read. Mr. James argues that the gifts of the Jewish people will make them specially useful in the era of reconstruction, and then he goes on to face the problem presented to Christendom by an "intransigent Israel": Judaism's resistance, he maintains, is not rational, but is in the blood, and it can only be overcome by a Catholicism of the same kind, which does not seem very helpful. However, when both Roman Catholicism and Protestant Missionary Societies are becoming "Jew-conscious", it may be that more success will attend efforts at evangelization.

Mr. C. K. Allen's *Democracy and the Individual* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) is a lively, and sometimes provocative, discussion of the crucial problem of our times. What is democracy? In what sense are men equal, how can they exercise individual responsibility for government, what are the limits of personal liberty? On these and similar topics the Warden of Rhodes House writes with cogency and courage.

Protestants would do well to read Dr. Edward Leen's *What is Education?* (Burns, 10s. 6d.), the work of an Irish scholar with a long experience of teaching. Dr. Leen writes easily—perhaps too easily, for there seems no reason why he should ever stop—but his pupils will probably tell him that he always misspells "ascendancy", that "ambition" is not a verb, and that the Joan of Arc he praises did most of the things that he enjoins girls not to do (the "Womanhood" chapter is the weakest in the book). Often Dr. Leen wins our warm assent, but invariably before long he substitutes "Catholic" for "Christian" and we have to part company:

> The Catholic educationist has means, enjoyed by no other, of in-

> vesting the humanly great with winsomeness and charm. . . . Since it is only Catholic educationists that take account of the fact of original sin, they alone can evolve a system which is not bound to be stamped from the outset with failure.

Against the evil tendencies resulting from original sin are those "having their origin in the habitual or divine grace given at baptism". The whole system, tone and training, and objective of the Catholic school must be unlike that of all others. This applies even to curriculum, for patristics must be included in the teaching of classics.

Many of the wise things Dr. Leen has to say are found in the section on the catechism, which admits the failure of Catholicism to hold its youth. Those enthusiastic for "agreed syllabuses" would do well to remember that "the growing child in its character reflects not a book, but the person under whose ascendency (*sic*) the child comes".

Social Therapy (Williams & Norgate, 5s.), by Lt.-Commander M. B. Hale, took back our minds over thirty years to the Bradford City Guild of Help. This little "introductory study" contains little in the way of guidance for the case-worker that we did not learn then, but it should prove a useful manual for the beginner.

Mr. Charles Reith is an enthusiast, and this fact gives life to his books. He contends that "the story of the police and their achievements is one of which the people of Great Britain have more reason to be proud than any other"; that the people are law-abiding is due to the police, and if New York had but followed London when it made inquiries there would have been no gangsters. For almost every democratic achievement in Britain Mr. Reith gives credit to the police, and he now urges a Ministry of Political Security at home and a Disarmament Police abroad. The best pages of *British Police and the Democratic Ideal* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) are those which tell of the years between 1829 and 1839 when the police had to make their way against political opposition, popular prejudice, and vested interests. Their success was due in large measure to the tact and patience of the first Commissioners, Charles Rowan and Richard Mayne. Better proof-reading would have removed "asknowledged", "dilitariness", "dicipline", and "anomolous".

Misses Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud have followed up *Young Children in War-time* by *Infants without Families* (Allen & Unwin, 5s. & 3s. 6d.), a fascinating study of the life of children in a residential nursery. The book convincingly proves that such nurseries "afford excellent opportunities for detailed and unbroken observation of child development", and most ably surveys the effect of nursery life on the child:

> There are realms in the infant's life where the residential nursery can be very helpful by creating conditions for development (health, hygiene, development of skills, early social responses). There are other realms where it is important for residential nurseries to recognize their limitations (emotional life, character development).

Many, and not least those who have to practise the difficult art of talking to boys, will be glad to have collected the Dean of Durham's *Shrewsbury Fables, Eton Fables, More Eton Fables,* and *Final Eton Fables* in one volume, *Fables and Fancies* (Blackwell, 12s. 6d.). Dr. Alington is not uniformly successful, but often he "pulls it off"; sometimes, too, the verses he introduces are very apt.

A Victorian School (Blackwell, 12s. 6d.) is the well-told story of Wellington College by one who has loved it and served it, Mr. R. St. C. Talboys.

Founded in memory of the Duke of Wellington, with the primary intention of training the orphan sons of officers in the Army, Wellington has passed through many changes during its ninety years of life. It was made by its first Head, E. W. Benson—*Ceteris Archiepiscopus Nobis Magister;* he was succeeded by men of varied types, and in October, 1940, the new young Master, Robert Longden, was killed when the College was bombed. Wellington, says Mr. Talboys, found and fulfilled himself in large and simple allegiance to the Army and to the service of the Crown, and the College which bears his name has trained many with this spirit. The illustrations, as the text, will give pleasure to Old Wellingtonians; perhaps they alone will understand all the terms used, for Mr. Talboys does nothing to help the lesser breeds.

We are told that the Livingstone Press's "Practical Books" (1s. 6d.) are found very useful by teachers of young children. No. 4 is Miss Winifred Warr's *Palestine and Beyond;* its predecessors have dealt with Africa, China, and India. The Frieze Painting Books (1s. each) are also of service: No. 3 is *Palestine: The Countryside.*

The purpose of Dr. Kathleen Freeman's *Voices of Freedom* (Muller, 7s. 6d.) is to "show the democratic basis of our country, besides providing an epitome of our history" by means of a collection of extracts from speeches in Parliament. One third of the book, "Origins", brings the story to the beginnings of Parliament; the rest, through Peter Wentworth, Sir John Eliot, John Hampden, Cromwell, John Wilkes, William Wilberforce, William Cobbett, Charles Bradlaugh, down to Mr. Lloyd George and to Mr. Churchill in 1943, make an interesting anthology. Dr. Freeman's concern is with political freedom; she does not discuss the more fundamental freedom in which the freedom of the citizen has its roots.

Margiad Evans's *Autobiography* (Blackwell, 8s. 6d.)—"the record of my gravest (that is happiest) inner existence"—is a difficult book to estimate, and the blurb's challenging comparison with Richard Jefferies does not make it easier—nay, there is so much more vitality in the book when Miss Evans speaks of people rather than nature that we are convinced that here she is not using her proper medium. The book too is uneven: the first half is sombre, even morbid, with its pre-occupation with dreams and death, but there are admirable descriptive passages, as, *e.g.,* the account of the disturbance of the ants' nest, in the second. We had the unusual experience with the book of picking it up and not recognizing where we had stopped reading, a sign of how the introspection had failed to hold us—"My meaning grew in the earth and the firmament—I in the Nothing in which all is related" is meaningless to us. And do frogs frolic?

A book on elocution which is readable is an unusual phenomenon, but such is Mrs. A. M. Henderson's *The Art of Effective Speech* (Univ. of London Press, 2s. 6d.). Mrs. Henderson's advice is clear and practical and never mechanical or pedantic, and the book is worth reading for the selected passages for exercises alone.

Many people will open Mr. H. W. Greenwood's *Document Photography* (Focal Press, 7s. 6d.) with expectation, from the thousands who employ airgraph letters to librarians, from research students to technical photographers. The photostat and the microfilm are revolutionizing research, solving the problems of space and access, making speedy communication possible, and securing the preservation of records. Much of Mr. Greenwood's book, dealing with technical problems as it does, will be caviare to the general, but it opens a fascinating vista.

Jail-Bird Jim in the "World Adventure" series (Livingstone Press, 1s. 6d.) contains three good stories by I. A. Corbin, Chaile Green, and Howard Brown.

So much nonsense has been talked and written—sometimes by quite sensible persons—about the evils of examinations, that it was a pleasure to see Mr. J. L. Brereton's *The Case for Examinations* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.), "an account of their place in education with some proposals for their reform". The reform proposals include development of the syllabus and regional joint examinations, and in this section there is a vigorous criticism of the Norwood Report. Mr. Brereton draws on a long experience, and there are few aspects of the subject on which he does not touch. We believe that by and large examinations provide a fair test, and we do not see how they can be eliminated. They now possess few terrors, for most students take them in their stride. Perhaps we ought to say, however, that we are glad we have not to be examined on the diagrams on pp. 176 and 177 of Mr. Brereton's book.

EDITOR.

The Rev. C. W. Dugmore's *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) is a condensed and thoroughly documented discussion of the origins of early Christian worship, specially in relation to its Jewish antecedents. After referring to the common origin of the two types of worship (as shown by the *N.T.*), he proceeds to set out the features of the *early* Synagogue service, rightly emphasizing the fact that the Jewish Prayer-book of today contains much material that cannot have influenced the Christian liturgy. Thus, of the "Eighteen Benedictions", he regards only the first as pre-Christian (p. 105; a useful appendix sets these out in Hebrew and English, and in earlier and later forms). Next are discussed the Christian observance of both the Lord's Day and the Sabbath, also of fast-days. Mr. Dugmore thinks that there were daily services from the beginning, after the Synagogue pattern (p. 57). He distinguishes such services from the Eucharist (with which this book is not concerned). The observance of "canonical hours" shows no special influence of the Synagogue, but

> the four essential elements of the Pro-Anaphora [the general worship prior to the Eucharist], lections from Holy Scripture, homilies, prayers and the singing of psalms, were all adopted from the Jewish Synagogue worship.

The development of worship in the 4th and 5th centuries is then summarily indicated. The final assessment of the Jewish contribution is less extensive in its claims than some previous writers have urged; the author prefers to see parallel growth rather than direct influence (after the beginnings):

> the Christians' debt to the past is revealed rather in the subjects of their prayers and the general framework of their services than in the phraseology employed in their petitions.

This is a careful and useful piece of academic work, which will have to be taken into account by subsequent writers, within its own strictly defined limits. The author shows competent knowledge on both sides of his subject. In the presentation of the evidential data and in the conclusions drawn from them he approves himself as trustworthy. But it should be recognized that this is distinctly a book for the more specialized student of liturgical questions, and that it presupposes more knowledge of the background than the general reader is likely to bring.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Personalism in Theology (Boston Univ. Press, $2.50) is a volume of essays published in honour of Dr. A. C. Knudson, Dean Emeritus of the Boston University School of Theology. The essays are by associates and former students of Dr. Knudson, and the volume is edited by Dr. E. S. Brightman. The essays deal with the philosophy of Personalism and its application to the field of theology; and with such subjects as Personalism and Nature, Science and Religion, and Christian Ethics; they are all written by outstanding scholars. Bishop McConnell writes on "Bowne and Personalism" (Knudson was a pupil of Bowne's), and Dr. Elmer Leslie contributes a very interesting account of Dr. Knudson as a man and a teacher. Knudson came of a Norwegian stock, his father being a Norwegian pastor. This book, say the authors, "is an acknowledgment of a spiritual and intellectual debt that can never be fully repaid". It is at any rate a worthy tribute to a very distinguished teacher.

Mr. William C. Dick's *The Bible, its Letter and Spirit* (Dent, 7s. 6d.) covers a great extent of ground, including authorship and a brief summary and critical account of the books both of the Old and New Testaments. The broad results of modern scholarship are accepted, and allowing for the necessary compression they are clearly stated. But the real aim of the book is a spiritual interpretation of the Word, and in the main the principle adopted is Swedenborgian. Mr. Dick says that "the essence of the inspiration of the Word is the presence of a spiritual sense within the letter"; and again, "The whole of the Word is parabolic; and its real import is its heavenly or spiritual meaning". If you take Mr. Dick's point of view there is a very fair statement in his book of this line of Biblical interpretation. But this purely parabolic interpretation of the Bible has pitfalls and dangers, and it often runs to seed in all sorts of unrealities.

A. T. S. James.

Prof. H. Cunliffe-Jones's *The Holy Spirit* (Indep. Press, 2s.) is a notably careful and painstaking piece of work from the point of view of a systematic theologian. After an introduction and a chapter asking "What is the Holy Spirit?", the relation between the Spirit and the Word is briefly discussed; chapters follow on the Spirit's work of Reconciliation and Sanctification, and on the Church as His "distinctive sphere"; then we have His "means of grace" (prayer, public worship, and the practice of Christian love), "The Fruit of the Spirit", and "The Holy Spirit and the Life of Mankind". Each chapter is divided into sections, and nearly every section has a long quotation from some standard author, ranging from St. Augustine and St. Thomas, through Calvin, Goodwin, Owen, and Baxter, to such recent or contemporary exegetes as Kierkegaard, Swete, Forsyth, Barth, Vincent Taylor, Newton Flew, and Dodd. These quotations make up considerably more than a third of the whole book, and form its most striking feature. Such extensive documentation has its advantages, but, with so little condiment of comment, the large chunks are almost bound to cause heaviness and indigestion. They are perhaps also responsible for the small sense these pages yield of the Spirit as a living, moving personality, "warm, sweet, tender", at least if contrasted with the works of such early Puritans as Forbes, Sibbes, and Cradock. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the practical end of theology's wedge, and to these men the definitive text was "ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father", with "grieve not" and "quench not the Spirit" a close second and third. To them, as to Dale, the Spirit was a voice to be heard in experience before it was a doctrine to be taught, and, as such, was the safeguard of all

immediate, personal religion against the spurious claims of sacerdotalism. Prof. Cunliffe-Jones's approach may fairly be described as more dogmatic.

Nos. 5 and 6 of the "Forward Books" are *The Man in the Street,* by the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse, and *The Nonconformist Conscience,* by Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks. Dr. Cocks, after observing the origin of the *phrase,* "the Nonconformist Conscience", as recently as 1890, traces the history of the *thing* from 1662 onwards, through the political awakening in 1760-90, the reign of *laissez-faire* in the nineteenth century, with its background of an optimistic view of human nature, the social awakening of the 1880's, to passive resistance against the Education Act of 1902. He writes admiringly, yet critically, with more attention to the class consciousness than to the spiritual glories associated with the Nonconformist conscience, pointing out that it "is on the whole the conscience of [the] self-made man", and is not unrelated to "compensatory thinking" in connection with "defiance of the upper classes". "The middle-class character of Congregationalism is now our most serious liability". Dr. Cocks emphasizes "the inevitable tension between the Kingdom of God and the fallen world", and holds that "the State is itself sinful". He suggests that to a National Church which was "ceaselessly vigilant and uncompromisingly nonconformist" "Nonconformists might return". Mr. Whitehouse's book is divided into four main sections: man as "the crown of creation"; "the responsibility of being a man"; "the old Adam"; and "the new Adam". The argument is compact and closely reasoned, so that it is difficult to summarize; it expresses with conviction the particular theology favoured by the writers of this series. Thus, we hear of "this profound corruption of human nature, which leaves nothing sound and unaffected in the body or soul of man"; that "Joseph is given no part in the birth of the Saviour", in order to "safeguard the truth that here is a new departure in human history"; and that "the Holy Spirit, by the very way he works, creates the church to be his sphere of operation". It is not too easy to see where "the man in the street" comes in.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

NEW EDITIONS, *ETC.*

B. L. Manning's *Essays in Orthodox Dissent,* first published in 1939, has now been reprinted by Independent Press (6s.), which has also printed a new edition of the *Rodborough Bede Book* (4s.). The R.E.P. has reissued in cloth, with larger type and page (2s. 6d.) J. M. Macdougall Ferguson's *Look Upon a Little Child,* 35,000 copies of which have been sold in the children's 6d. edition. Hetty Lee's *Lessons on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (S.P.C.K., 5s.), for children between 8 and 11, now appears in a revised edition.

LECTURES, *ETC.*

We are glad to see Prof. John Foster's *World-wide* (Livingstone Press, 6d.), for the three addresses in it were among the most effective radio talks we have heard. The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright's "Uncensored Avowal", *Religion Tomorrow* (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.) is a searching analysis which deserves study. We share Mr. C. S. Lewis's concern expressed in the Riddell Lecture, *The Abolition of Man* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.), and value the catena of quotations, but we hope he won't become *too* clever: sometimes the inside right weaves wonderful patterns and misses scoring goals. Prof. Susan Stebbing's Hobhouse Lecture, *Men and Moral Principles* (Oxford Press, 2s.) reminds us what an acute mind we have lost in one who was perhaps our most distinguished woman philosopher. Special mention

must be made of Dr. T. H. Robinson's admirable brief biography of T. R. Glover (Carey Press, 6d.). The Oxford Press had issued two useful American pamphlets (6d. each): *Together for Peace,* introduced by Mr. Winant, contains speeches by President Roosevelt and Mr. Cordell Hull; *Democracy First,* introduced by Mr. Herbert Agar, speeches by Vice-President Wallace and Mr. Donald M. Nelson. Prof. J. L. Myres's Frazer Lecture, *Mediterranean Culture* (Cambridge Press, 2s.) is "an essay in historical geography" packed with information. In *The Way Out* (Oxford Press, 1s.) ex-Premier C. Rajagopalachari argues that mistakes were made by both sides at the time of the Cripps' mission to India, but that the situation cannot be left where it is. He urges, therefore, that India should accept the reiterated offer.

ALSO RECEIVED.

H. Elvet Lewis. *The Book Still Speaks.* Independent Press. 2s. "Addresses to Children on *O.T.* Texts.

R. Selby Wright. *The Greater Victory.* Longmans. 3s. 6d. Further Broadcast Talks.

Rec. *God and Comrade Norvic.* Carey Press. 1s. 6d. The Story of Two Factory Padres.

F. W. Bell. *Padre's Offensive Sweep.* Muller. 3s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

London Quarterly (Jan.). Some interesting articles, with Dr. Lofthouse on "Sacrificial and Sacramental" and the Rev. H. S. Darby on "The Cure of Souls" outstanding. Among other contributors are Mr. W. R. Niblett, Mr. E. E. Kellett, and Mr. W. G. Hanson, the last of whom writes on "Gerald Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon". Dr. Howard's editorial deals with Edwyn Bevan.

Hibbert Journal (Jan.). Mr. H. G. Wells's "Memorandum on Biological Survival" opens a very interesting and varied number, though the review section is inadequate and not up to the level of the articles. Dr. G. H. Leibholz discusses the problems facing the Allies owing to the fundamental difference between the totalitarian democracy of Russia and the liberal democracy of the Western Powers. The Rev. W. J. Ferrar (misspelt on the cover) tells of the financial experience of an Anglican clergyman. In "The Problem of Pain as a Doctor sees it" Dr. E. W. Adams acutely criticizes Mr. C. S. Lewis, and concludes there must be a spirit of evil at work, in the existence of which Dr. E. L. Langton, in "The Passing of Satan", urges that Jesus believed.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). We miss "From the House of the Four Winds", though there is compensation in two industrial articles, especially in B. Seebohm Rowntree's "Can We Abolish Mass Unemployment?" Margaret W. Harvey's "Friends and Christian Marriage" is helpful, and there is a moving tribute to Margaret Graham by some of her friends.

Evangelical Quarterly (Jan.). The Rev. James Mathers discusses "The Book of the Revelation in the 20th Century", Rev. Ian Henderson "Reflections on the Divinity Curriculum", Prof. G. D. Henderson "Jonathan Edwards and Scotland", and Dr. W. T. Cairns "The Religion of Dr. Johnson".

Church Quarterly Review (Jan.). Canon W. J. Pythian-Adams concludes his articles "Towards Union", the spirit of which we commend to all controversialists; and Miss Garrett her study of John Ponet and the exiled Marians, where much industry and skill are marred by obvious bias. This bias also characterizes many of the reviews, especially those of books by Free Churchmen.

Expository Times (Dec.-Mar.). Dr. Garvie is good on "Suggestive Variants" and among other Congregational contributors are the Revs. R. Abba ("Jesus, Man or Mediator?") and G. V. Jones ("Unamuno"). Among other articles are the Rev. R. W. Thomson's "The Detective Novel and the Preacher" and Canon Swift on "Jehovah's Witnesses".

International Review of Missions (Jan.). The review opens with appreciations of William Paton by Dr. John R. Mott and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Miss Sinclair was left with a difficult task in the preparation of the Annual Survey, but she has performed it triumphantly; perhaps it was the fact that it begins with Japan that aroused in us the fear that the general picture is a bit too rosy. That

there has been progress, however, is proved by the Rev. J. McLeod Campbell's comparison with 1843.

World Dominion (Jan.-Feb.). An informing and useful issue. The Rev. T. Cullen Young shows how near is the South African colour-theory to a *Herrenvolk* conception. Mr. M. Fraser, a member of the Iona Community, who has been working in a paper-mill, urges that today evangelism must be by life not words. Contributions by Dr. R. G. Cochrane, Dr. W. E. Sangster, and the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson are important. (Mar.-Apl.). The Rev. A. McLeish on "Religion in Soviet Russia" and Dr. Chirgwin's "America's Interest in Africa" are topical, but perhaps the most important article is the Rev. T. Cullen Young's "Herrenvolk and Sahib-Log", which discerns a gleam of hope in the African colour problem.

Harvard Theological Review (Oct.). Prof. M. P. Nilsson writes on "Problems of the History of Greek Religion in the Hellenistic and Roman Age", Prof. M. S. Enslin on "Luke and the Samaritans", and Dr. G. Zuntz on "The Opening Sentences of Melito's Paschal Homily".

Anglican Theological Review (Jan.). A good number. Dr. H. R. Bennett's "Salimbene" opens, and among other articles are Prof. C. C. Richardson's "Christian Redemption" and Dr. H. H. Straton's "Jesus, Exegesis, and War". President Coffin reminds readers of James Ussher, "an Anglican Predecessor of the 'Basic Principles' ".

Review of Religion (Nov.). 60 pp. of book reviews. There is an appreciation of Dr. H. R. Zimmer, whose lecture, "Sri-yantra and Siva-trimurti", is given the first place. Dr. Charles Hartshorne gives "A Mathematical Analysis of Theism", and Prof. E. A. Singer, Jr., contributes "Thoughts on a Translation of Schelling's *Weltalter*".

Review and Expositor (Oct.). We are glad to see Prof. S. L. Stealey's "Balthasar Hubmaier and Some Perennial Religious Problems". Dr. W. E. Denham's "Sex Education and the Church" will be found useful. 40 pp. of reviews.

Review of Religion (Jan.). 40 pp. of articles, 70 pp. of reviews, including 20 pp. on Prof. Morey's *Early Christian Art*. The main articles are Mr. A. H. Krappe's "Phaëthon" and Mr. Luitpold's "This-Worldliness and Otherworldliness, Time and Eternity".

Religion and Life (Winter). Perhaps the item which will most interest British readers is a scathing review of Dr. Joad's *God and Evil* by the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead. Among the articles Prof. F. C. Grant's "Edward Gibbon's Five Causes", Prof. Sorokin's "Russian Religion: Its Evolution Through Revolution" (a history and defence of the Russian Orthodox Church) and Dr. Latourette's "The Effect of Missionary Enterprise upon the American Mind" are outstanding.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MAKING OF THE INDIAN PRINCES

SIR,—Your reviewer of *The Making of the Indian Princes* complains that it "has the appearance of a book which has lacked final revision" and fills up his space with examples of my carelessness. One I acknowledge, and thank him for drawing my attention to the slip which once makes Sir George Barlow Sir Thomas. As to "strange punctuation", the established practice is to keep the punctuation of authors whom you quote; it is often bad by modern standards, but it is unscholarly to change it and may lead to the suspicion that you took your quotation at second hand. Your reviewer, however, finds "more serious" the fact that "there is no map of India, and terms such as *vakil, nautch, chauth,* and *deshmakh* appear without explanation".

There are two maps, not of all India—publishers cannot now squander inessential illustrations—but of the two regions which together cover the book's whole action. *Chauth* and *deshmukh* (which your reviewer misspells) are explained in a footnote on page 14, which is quite early on in the book and is their first occurrence. *Vakil* and *nautch* I did not explain, for an author has no right to insult his readers. Both are among the half-dozen Indian words which are known to everyone who has ever opened a book

about India. My test is the one-volume standard *Oxford Dictionary*, which gives them both as ordinary English words, in plain type and not in italics. Finally, what is wrong with the expression "formed a mutual kindness"—unless your reviewer thinks that the vulgar misuse of "mutual", borrowed from Dickens (*Our Mutual Friend*) is the correct use?

Yours sincerely,

Oxford. January 30, 1944. EDWARD THOMPSON.

[Our reviewer writes:

Dr. Thompson, for whose work we have often expressed appreciation, has no right to take umbrage because we think a book falls below his usual standard and say frankly how it impresses us. We did feel the punctuation (not in quotations) was often weird; we did, with others, feel the lack of maps, and the need of explanation of Indian terms; we still think "formed a mutual kindness" is not English. We accept Dr. Thompson's correction of one Indian word, but the fact that the proof-readers did not catch the misspelling in itself suggests its unfamiliarity; and we apologize for missing the explanation of two of these in a footnote.]

A LUCKY BAG.

DEAR SIR,—You do your readers an injustice in thinking they would not share your excitement in the contents of "A Lucky Bag", which are described in the January number of *The Congregational Quarterly*. Among the treasures was *The Commonwealth Mercury* of the week September 2-9, 1658, in which the Protector's death was announced and also an advertisement of Bunyan's third book, *A Few Sighs from Hell or the Groans of a Damned Soul*. A writer in *Notes and Queries* (Third Series, III, 325) asks whether the placing of this advertisement after the announcement was a mere accident or a piece of malicious suggestion on the part of some royalist. This book of Bunyan's was translated into Welsh in 1829 and into Gaelic in 1846.

The name of Sir Matthew Hale in connection with the trial of *The Perjur'd Phanatick*, one of the pamphlets in the Lucky Bag, is another link with Bunyan, for he was one of the two Justices of Assize to whom Bunyan sent from prison three petitions begging for an open trial in court. Bunyan's wife ventured to make a personal appeal to Sir Matthew Hale, who received her kindly, but nothing came of her pitiful plea.

These details are taken from Dr. John Brown's *John Bunyan*.

Yours faithfully,

Pinehurst, Cambridge. Feb. 14th, 1944. (Mrs.) J. LLOYD.

THE CHURCHES AND HEALTH.

SIR,—Your suggestion regarding diphtheria immunisation is good, and easily practicable. I am often amazed here in —— that although a number of our churches are housing post-natal and infant welfare clinics there seems to be no contact between the churches and those who staff the clinics or those who attend at them. That surely is one direction in which we might hope to establish contact with many parents who never visit churches or send their children to the same premises on Sundays. And as a field for genetic and pastoral psychology, what better could one wish?

Yours truly,

4th Jan., 1944. CIVIL DEFENCE OFFICER.